

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

PROFESSORS AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

MIGUEL ANTONIO CARO GUTIÉRREZ

NATHALIA MARÍN PALACIO

UNIVERSIDAD TECNOLÓGICA DE PEREIRA
FACULTAD DE BELLAS ARTES Y HUMANIDADES
LICENCIATURA EN LENGUA INGLESA

PEREIRA

2016

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

PROFESSORS AND STUDENTS' REACTIONS TOWARDS ORAL CORRECTIVE
FEEDBACK IN AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

MIGUEL ANTONIO CARO GUTIÉRREZ

NATHALIA MARÍN PALACIO

Trabajo de grado presentado como requisito parcial para obtener el título de
Licenciado en Lengua Inglesa

Asesor:

Dolly Ramos Gallego

UNIVERSIDAD TECNOLÓGICA DE PEREIRA
FACULTAD DE BELLAS ARTES Y HUMANIDADES
LICENCIATURA EN LENGUA INGLESA

PEREIRA

2016

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

RESUMEN

El propósito de este estudio fue subrayar las percepciones que tienen los profesores y estudiantes de un programa de licenciatura en lengua inglesa hacia la retroalimentación correctiva en clases de lengua. El estudio fue llevado a cabo en una universidad pública de la ciudad de Pereira en Colombia en el cual participaron 7 profesores entre hombres y mujeres, como también 15 estudiantes del programa de diferentes sexos a los que se les aplicaron entrevistas individuales. Diferentes observaciones, entrevistas y cuestionarios virtuales fueron usados como métodos de recolección de datos con el propósito de obtener evidencias de los eventos de clase y las percepciones de los estudiantes y profesores. La pregunta que orientó esta investigación fue: ¿qué se puede decir acerca de las percepciones profesores y las actitudes de los estudiantes hacia la retroalimentación oral correctiva dada en cursos de lengua en un programa de Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa en Pereira?

Los resultados demostraron que los errores más comunes en el estudio fueron de sintaxis, léxico y pronunciación. Además se halló que los profesores evitan proveer retroalimentación oral en ciertas ocasiones; finalmente, los estudiantes percibieron las estrategias de retroalimentación explícita como directas y las implícitas como dadas con tacto y respeto.

Como parte final, este estudio quiso demostrar la importancia que tiene la retroalimentación correctiva en la preparación académica de los futuros profesores de inglés con el propósito de ayudar a sus futuros aprendices a mejorar la competencia del habla dentro de un ambiente colaborativo y amigable.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to highlight the perceptions that professors and students of an English Language Teaching program had regarding oral corrective feedback in language classes. The research was carried out in a Colombian T-state University in Pereira with 7 male and female professors that teach language courses, and 15 male and female students. The methods implemented for collecting data were individual interviews, observations, and virtual questionnaires in order to gather strong evidence from classroom events, and students and professors' perceptions. The question that guided the investigation was what can be said about professors' perceptions and students' attitudes in regards to the oral corrective feedback given in the language courses of an English Language Teaching program in Pereira?

The results demonstrated that the most common type of errors were of syntax, lexical and pronunciation. Besides, professors avoided feedback provision in certain circumstances; finally, students perceived explicit feedback strategies as direct and implicit ones as tactful and polite.

As a final point, this study intended to show the importance that corrective feedback has in the academic preparation of the future English teachers with the purpose to help their future learners to improve their speaking language competence within a friendly and collaborative class environment.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I never imagined writing this section on my graduation project, now I see how difficult it is. I have to think about whom I should include or not. However, I want to be clear that: "the order of things does not alter the product"; indeed, everyone was valuable in my life to achieve this personal goal. Here I go:

I would first like to thank God, the supernatural force, the universe or the center of life. Secondly, I want to include my parents since they are my inspiration, my support, my coaches, my leaders; in other words my life. Thirdly, my girlfriend Nathalia Marín that has been: my crutches when I have been limping, my classmate when I did my assignments, my academic wife inasmuch as without her I would not make real this project, and my force to try to do my best in whatever I do. Fourthly, I also like to mention and thank my two academic mothers Dolly Ramos Gallego and Kelly Paola Buitrago, they were my partners, my friends, and my ground connection. They always made me smile in adversity times; their support was invaluable to me given the fact that they steered me in the right direction whenever they thought I needed it.

I would also like to thank the other two coauthors and friends who were involved in the validation survey, observations and questionnaires for this research project: Sandra Lorena and Diana Milena. Without their passionate participation, high research abilities, and tremendous collaboration, this research could not have been successfully developed. Furthermore, I must express my very profound gratitude to Professor Gonzaga Castro Arboleda, he was my spiritual, academic and professional guide. I thank God to have been run into this magnificent person. Finally, I must express my sincere thanks to the professors of this program for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

study and for always giving their soul in every class I received. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you.

Miguel Antonio Caro Gutiérrez

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Just after finishing all this process, I can be aware of all the people involved in this project that from a direct or indirect way have contributed in developing this project, as well as giving me enough academic and emotional support in order to achieve this important goal in my life. First of all, I would like to thank my boyfriend and academic couple Miguel who has always been promoting the development of this project from their extraordinary capacity of going beyond and always finding the correct author to support each statement. I cannot imagine working with anyone, but you. Thanks for all your academic and emotional support. Secondly, I would like to thank my co-partners from this research Diana y Lorena for all your commitment and willingness to cooperate with us; also, for all your help and the good moments we spend each other. Besides, I would like to acknowledge professor Dolly Ramos for all the guidance and support you provided during these two years within the research path. I have learnt a lot from you, your passion for your job, your happiness and more than my professor, I consider you my friend and Kelly Paola Buitrago for being always there cheering us up and being our great friend. Thanks both for all the memories.

On the other hand, I would like to show gratitude for my family. Thanks to my mother for your comprehension, economical support and all the love you have given to me during these last years. I hope you can be as proud of me as I can be for the mother you have become. In addition, I want to recognize all what I have learnt from you during these years, my dear father-in law Miguel. You are my inspiration and model to follow as teacher. Also, my mother- in law Ana, I want to thank you for all your pieces of advice, comprehension and support when I had to be in your house during hours working with Miguel. I would like to acknowledge my third family, the professors of the licenciatura which have been very kind with me and in any or other way have influenced in the development of this project and in my professional growth. Thank

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

you to all of you, especially to professor Clara Inés, Ronald, Isabel Cristina and Enrique, which through their guidance and help provided during any moment of the research have enriched it until this final outcome, as well as, strengthen my professional profile through your assistance and example of how an English teacher should be. Last but not least, I want to dedicate this project to God, the one who has gave me the power to become the person I am in this moment, as well as, to my father whom I believe is celebrating all my personal and professional achievements in the heaven.

Nathalia Marín Palacio

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

TABLA DE CONTENIDO

RESUMEN	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	3
3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	10
3.1. Introduction to Language Skills	11
3.1.1. Productive skills.	12
3.2. Oral Interaction	20
3.2.1. Characteristics of conversation	20
3.2.2. Types of oral interaction	22
3.3. Students' Preferences Regarding Pair and Group Work:	23
3.3.1. Advantages and disadvantages of group and pair work in oral interaction	24
3.4. Inter Language	25
3.5. Errors and Mistakes: A General Overview	27
3.5.1. Types of errors for lack of knowledge of language rules	28
3.5.2. Types of errors for comprehension	29
3.5.3. Varieties of linguistic errors.....	29
3.5.4. Classification of morpho syntactic errors.....	31
3.5.5. Sources of errors	32
3.6. Fossilization.....	34
3.7. Oral Corrective Feedback	35
3.7.1. What is feedback?	35
3.7.2. Types of feedback.....	37
3.7.3. Corrective feedback.....	38
4. LITERATURE REVIEW	46
5. METHODOLOGY	51
5.1. Type of Study	51
5.1.1. Qualitative research study	51
5.1.2. Descriptive research study	53
5.1.3. Case study	54
5.2. Context and setting	55
5.3. Participants.....	56
5.3.1. Professors	56
5.3.2. Students	57

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

5.3.3. Researchers' role.....	58
5.4. Methods of data collection	59
5.4.1. Observation.....	59
5.4.2. Observation grid.....	60
5.4.3. Interviewing.....	62
5.4.4. Virtual questionnaire	62
5.5. Data analysis.....	63
5.5.1. Grounded theory	63
5.6. Ethical Considerations	70
6. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION:	72
6.1. Students' most salient errors evidenced in oral activities.....	72
6.1.1. Main linguistic errors committed by learners in oral activities.....	72
6.2. Professors' reasons for overlooking errors or delaying feedback in oral activities	81
6.2.1. Professors' focus on content rather than on language structures	81
6.2.2. Professors' omission of errors in fluency-focused activities	85
6.2.3. Professors' preferences for giving delay feedback in oral activities.	90
6.3. Students' perceptions towards oral feedback.....	93
6.3.1. Students' perceptions towards explicit correction strategies:	93
6.3.2. Students' preferences towards implicit correction strategies:.....	98
7.LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	106
8. CONCLUSIONS	109
9. RESEARCH AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS	111
9.1. Pedagogical Implications	111
9.2. Research Implications.....	112
10. REFERENCES	114
11. APPENDICES.....	130
11.1. Appendix 1: Observation Grid.....	130
11.2. Appendix 2: Interview Format.....	135
11.3. Appendix 3: Questionnaire Format	142
11.4. Appendix 4: E-Mail Sent To Professors	147
11.5. Appendix 5: Consent Letter.....	148

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

1. INTRODUCTION

This qualitative descriptive case study aimed at exploring professors and students' perceptions and beliefs in regards to oral corrective feedback from an English language teaching program, taking into consideration corrective feedback has an important place in learning a second or foreign language, so professors usually seek to help students to identify their language errors in the speech and thus, to improve their language proficiency.

For this study, the theoretical background, methodology and results will be explored in detail in this document. In the first place, the document will state the importance of the study by contextualizing the reader and justifying the reasons to conduct the current research; in this case, the question that guided the investigation was what can be said about professors' perceptions and students' attitudes in regards to the oral corrective feedback given in the language courses of an English Language Teaching program in Pereira?

After that, a theoretical framework, based on the contributions provided by Corder (1967), Ellis (2009), Krashen (1983) among some other authors, will be presented and key concepts will be classified as an antecedent for conducting this project, as well as related studies that have been made in the field. Furthermore, the section of the methodology describes the instruments used to collect data (observations, interviews and questionnaires), the participants (professors and students' from ELT program) and context of the study. Next, the findings are presented and are divided into three findings, being these called students' most salient errors evidenced in oral activities, professors' reasons for

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

overlooking errors or delaying feedback in oral activities and students' perceptions towards oral feedback, which will show evidence collected from the different methods, along with a discussion supported by related authors in the field.

For the first finding, the results indicated that syntax, lexical and pronunciation errors were the most frequently evidenced throughout the process as a result of multiple reasons, such as L1 interference, lack of practice and the lack of knowledge of the correct rule. The second finding illustrated the reasons why professors deliberately avoided error correction. First, as a way to favor content over language structures; secondly, omitting error correction during fluency-focused activities and finally, as a way to provide feedback after the activity finishes. The last result demonstrated students and professors' perceptions in regards to explicit and implicit correction. In terms of explicit feedback, students from lower language level prefer explicit correction strategies as it makes them aware of the errors immediately. On the other hand, higher level students favor implicit strategies for their tactfulness and sensitiveness.

Moreover, the limitations of the study are discussed in order to share some of the challenges found during the development of this project. Some of these dealt with the unavailability of time, students' lack of knowledge about some concepts needed to conduct interviews and students as well as professors' unwillingness to participate in the study. Besides, the conclusions are presented with the purpose to answer the research question and an examination. Lastly, the implications of this study suggest avoiding overcorrection during oral activities as a way to promote participation and decrease anxiety and frustration in learners. In the same line of ideas, professors are recommended to be aware of students'

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

personality, as well as to be cautious at the moment of providing explicit corrective feedback.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the last thirty years, Colombia has been involved in the creation of new economic and commercial alliances with different countries, such as United States of America, China and the European Union that has arisen as consequence from the *Apertura económica* leaded by César Gaviria Trujillo's Government or *Tratado de Libre Comercio* during Juan Manuel Santos' government campaign. Based on this situation, the necessity of training Colombian people in a foreign language has grown, especially English which can be used as *lingua franca* for international negotiations. Therefore, the Colombian Government has been requiring well- trained teachers with a C1 English proficiency level. This means according to the CEFRL (2001) a high proficiency level, in which a person feel fully comfortable, has the ability to be creative with the language, has broad lexical repertoire and can use language flexibly and effectively for social purposes.

Due to the fact that the majority of instructors scarce with this professional profile, the Ministry of Education (MEN) has designed a project called "Colombia very well" where Colombian high school students are expected to have a B1+ level proficiency in the foreign language in 2025; in other words, the language user has an intermediate level in which he is aware of the salient politeness conventions and acts appropriately, can produce continuous

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

writing which is generally intelligible, and has a clearly intelligible pronunciation. Within this project four main lines are stated, (i) training and support for teachers; (ii) pedagogical aspects (iii) assessment and monitoring; and (iv) management for institutional strengthening, but it is relevant to mention that training and supporting teachers should be the main area of concern for contributing to Colombian public education since it is necessary to support professionals with pedagogical tools in order to enhance praxis in classroom events.

Given the fact that providing support to public high school English teachers is required to improve English level student, one of the challenges in Colombia very well is that about 3.000 teachers can embrace and participate in the program; this means, motivating English teachers to attend to training programs in order to improve their language skills, as well as, their classroom management skills, but at the same time, providing them the support and constant accompaniment with the purpose to assess and guaranteeing the quality in their performance. However, it has been demonstrated that there are not enough teachers to cover the necessities of Colombian education, and their language level tends to be below the standards proposed by the government. Indeed, according to statistics, just the 48% of the new high school graduates have B1 level. In this way, Sanchez (2013) argues the deficiency in the teachers' level of proficiency is caused by the lack of quality in pedagogical programs in which they were formed since the results of the test saber pro showed that just 36% of the pre-service teachers had a language level above B1, showing that most graduates of English Language Teaching degrees are at low level. In this manner, he suggests that the solution for low results in students from public and private schools is to improve the linguistic

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

competences in English teachers. In the same line, one of the solutions provided by the MEN is to improve English language level in Colombian EFL teachers to a minimum of B2+ level (based on CEFRL standards) through continuous support of tutors and provision of pertinent incentives from now to 2025.

Furthermore, a study carried out by Arias, Ramos & Cárdenas (2013) in 12 out of 13 towns of Risaralda, which has as a purpose to meet the most common attitudes, perceptions and beliefs of the educational community towards the learning and teaching of English, has demonstrated the flaws in the methodological practices of EFL classes due to the special emphasis in the linguistic competence (strengthening solely vocabulary, syntax and grammar), and the lack of reinforcement of the sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence, which do not allow students to adjust the discourse according to the context. In addition, English classes have a tendency to develop only Low Order Thinking Skills, such as identifying, memorizing, repeating, among others, which indirectly underuse other students' cognitive capacities that can be exploited depending of students' ages, such as analyzing, contrasting and creating. Moreover, students have few expositions to authentic materials and pedagogical tools, limiting the receptive skill to the teachers' voice, and the production skill is linked primarily to the written language, reporting few attempts to encourage the speaking skill. Based on the authors aforementioned, Al Jawi (2010) recommended the use of different methodologies within a communicative purpose, involving the integration of the four language skills in EFL classes.

Taking the previous statements into consideration, the speaking skill in Colombian classrooms tends to be limited to foster participation and drilling activities; one of the reasons why English teachers can experiment some difficulties to rehearse this skill in

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

language classrooms is contemplated by Dincer, Yesilyurt, & Göksu, (2012), who explain that speaking is an intricate skill involving the complexity of deciding what and how should be expressed an intended message and at the same time, involving some aspects, such as: accuracy, fluency, pronunciation and vocabulary. Considering these aspects at the moment of teaching speaking, it is needed to add that some errors and mistakes can arise, so the teacher has the duty to choose the correct strategy in order to provide a corrective feedback that can be appropriate for students' errors. Therefore, some studies suggest that corrective feedback does not affect university learners' motivation given the fact that the role university students have as active learners is to look at the feedback as a beneficial instrument to identify and reflect upon errors and mistakes that should be overcome in order to improve their productive language skills (Kavaliauskienė & Anusienė, 2012).

In addition, a study conducted by Abukhadrah (2012) to 20 Arab males students enrolled in an advanced English program in a Midwestern University, as well as, 10 native English language teachers, where he was exploring the attitudes and perceptions of teachers and advanced language students regarding oral error correction, concluded that both populations have different opinions towards error correction and feedback; based on this result, it is evident that there is a need for further research in different types of students population, such as basic level students, and students from ELT programs, taking into the account the assumption that, how can the awareness about suitable feedback strategies improve, if the students, being the main characters of the feedback process, are not involved in them?

Considering, on the other hand, particular differences embedded in each society, the mentioned study suggests that socio cultural aspects can influence considerably perceptions

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

and beliefs in language learners about preferred ways to be corrected in oral interaction. In this sense, it is not accurate to believe that a study conducted in Saudi Arabia has the same repercussions and results in the Colombian setting since Arabian culture and their beliefs commonly differ vastly from the Colombian perspective; thus, producing the need to execute new research in Colombia about the attitudes prospective language teachers and ELT professors have regarding types of errors that need to be corrected, and the most effective types of feedback to be arranged in class.

Regarding corrective feedback, some studies have been carried out searching the most recognized types and strategies that teachers use to correct learners in the aural perform (Chu, 2011) and (Hernandez, Reyes and Murrieta, 2010). Bearing in mind teachers' performance in EFL classes, Chu (2011) researched the effectiveness of corrective feedback in communicative teaching method and in task-based method examining whether corrective feedback has a positive effect on improving oral English accuracy. Having this purpose in mind, the author explored which types of corrective feedback have better effect on improving accuracy and whether the group's language level (low- medium- high) can or cannot interfere with the outcomes. The results in this study showed that feedback has significant effects in learners' accuracy improvement in the case where students were exposed to explicit correction; furthermore, corrective feedback had influence depending on students' language level; in this sense, low and medium level students had more opportunity to improve in their process.

Following the same line, a study developed by (Hernandez, Reyes and Murrieta, 2010) reported that implicit correction is the strategy that teachers preferred to use since they have positive effect on students in terms of fluency. Another important aspect considered is that

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

corrective feedback should be done at the beginning of a language process in order to avoid fossilization. However, a common problem found in the current study is the lack of pedagogical sources teachers have in order to correct speaking activities; in other words, teachers usually have difficulties in order to know when and how a speaking activity should be interrupted for giving suitable feedback; at the same time, undergraduate students from English language teaching (ELT) programs do not have a solid background in teaching to make the decision of giving certain type of corrective feedback in a defined context. Thus, the significance of the current research consists on collecting enough information through surveys and observations to help teachers to be aware of what type of feedback they will use according to the context and the population

In summation, considering the lack of research found regarding perceptions and attitudes towards error correction conducted in different EFL students and teachers' populations, this provoke the need of embracing new populations, such as ELT pre-service teachers and university professors for a deeper understanding of the area. Furthermore, studies in the field of perceptions towards correcting errors in the oral production have not been carried out in the country, creating the need to develop this research, taking into account that social conceptions regarding feedback in Colombia can differ from other cultures where similar studies have been conducted. Moreover, the few opportunities Colombian students have for improving their speaking skill, and the lack of background EFL teachers in the country have about corrective feedback, makes the implementation of a research necessary to show in their findings the most appropriate ways for correcting mistakes in language learners, and this can lead to strategies that can help language teachers to have a better performance in their classes and to grow professionally. Therefore, the

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

purpose of this research is to identify the different perceptions and beliefs students from ELT programs, as well as university professors have regarding corrective feedback, and which strategies are the most effective in EFL scenarios. In this sense, the main research question that will guide the study is: What can be said about professors' perceptions and students' attitudes in regards to the oral corrective feedback given in the language courses of an English Language Teaching program in Pereira?

3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explore deeply the different concepts that will give support to the current research. In this sense, the four language skills will be addressed, focusing on the productive skills, defined as the language outcomes produced by human beings during daily life interactions; these at the same time encompass speaking and writing skill which differ for the mode of communication (oral and written). Bearing in mind the project will be emphasized on the speaking skill, this will be broadly described, embracing the different characteristics that are indispensable to develop this skill, such as fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, comprehensibility, among others. Next, oral interaction will be defined as an interactive process where participants construct meaning, involving the specific characteristics oral interaction has (Thornbury, 2007) and some recommendations made by some authors to enhance this ability in EFL classrooms.

On the other hand, interlanguage will be categorised as the biological counterpart of universal grammar (Lennenberg, 1967, cited in Selinker 1972). Errors and mistakes will be defined and contrasted by (Corder, 1967), mentioning the multiple types of errors, such as linguistic, morpho syntactic, comprehension errors, among others and the sources of these errors, being psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic. In addition, fossilization will be addressed by Selinker (1972) as the process in which linguistic rules tend to keep in L2 learners' interlanguage, no matter the amount of explanation they receive. Furthermore, corrective feedback will be conceived by (Ellis, 2009) as the provision of suggestions that encourage students to correct errors and mistakes in order to improve their proficiency level. In this way, the characteristics of a good feedback practice will be revealed, as well

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

as, the different types of feedback coined by Lyster and Ranta (1997), such as explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic cue, echoing and some other strategies that can be used in the language classroom for correcting learners' mistakes. Finally, some techniques to give feedback in the oral skill and some controversies which have taken place in regards to the effectiveness of corrective feedback will be displayed.

3.1. Introduction to Language Skills

In daily life, people use the four language skills -listening, speaking, reading and writing- in a communicative, mixed way without being aware of it. This becomes a challenge for language teachers as they need to encourage students to use the four skills of the language in an integrated way, using them in real life scenarios and with high proficiency level; as a matter of fact, Davies & Pearse (2000) assure that “real success in English teaching and learning is when the learners can actually communicate in English inside and outside the classroom” (p. 99). However, it is common in English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms expose students to traditional language teachers which practice these skills in a separate way, focusing materials and activities in one specific skill at a time (Jing, 2006).

The separation of these skills of the language is produced as a result of two main components, the mode of communication (oral or written) and the directions of communication (receptive and productive). These are represented in the following chart according to SIL International (1999):

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

	Oral	Written
Receptive	Listening	Reading
Productive	Speaking	Writing

Table 1: Language skills

Even though all language skills are closely related in human interactions, the productive skills, as the name indicates, permit people to produce language and allow humans to express their ideas, feelings and contributions to society. This document will emphasize in these skills, being widely explained below.

3.1.1. Productive skills.

Productive skills are human beings abilities to generate outcomes or ways in which people use the language they have learned or acquired to produce a message represented by *speaking* and *writing* (Al-Jawi, 2010). Productive skills have an important role in the language learning process since “they permit learners to perform in communicative aspects, such as oral presentations, written studies and reports among others” (Alvarado, 2013; p.1). The focus of this project is on the productive speaking skill, which is not only the ability of uttering words through the mouth, but it also involves the transmission of an oral message (Bashir, Azeem & Hussain, 2011).

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

3.1.1.1. Speaking.

Learning speaking in the first language (L1) is given in a natural way, where listening and repeating are essential to be able to produce language. These same patterns can be brought into the classroom with a foreign language although it requires more practice and attention (Bashir, Azeem & Dogar, 2011 p. 35).

Speaking is a process that could happen in any time, making relations between speaker and hearer. In fact, during this interaction speakers should make decisions about what things they should say and how to say them (Dinçer, Yesilyurt, & Göksu, 2012). In this sense, there are some aspects that involve the act of communication, as the type of interaction, the message, the speakers' personalities, among others. In fact, Richards (2008) states that “different speech styles reflect perceptions of the social roles of the participants in a speech event” (p. 21). This means that depending on how participants express themselves, they can show their social role, age, status and politeness, allowing the hearer to make judgments of their personality.

Taking into consideration the different functions speaking can include, the previous author used an expanded three-part version of Brown and Yule's framework (1983), where he made the distinction between interactional and transactional functions of speaking; he refers to these terms as *talk as interaction, talk as transaction and talk as performance*:

Talk as interaction refers to the primary social function in a conversation, for example a greeting; *talk as transaction*, on the other hand, is the one that is focused on the

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

meaning of the message; that is, the talk has a specific purpose where understanding is the most important part; and *talk as performance* means the discourse for an audience in which the speaker prepares the speech to transmit certain information.

Within the message transmitted by speaking, there are certain aspects that can or cannot affect the performance in real life, for communication or in the educational setting. They involve fluency, accuracy and comprehensibility (Heaton 1988 cited in Rahman, 2011).

3.1.1.2.Aspects that intervene in speaking performance.

The speaking skill encompasses several aspects that can allow or stop communication. These aspects may help to achieve the competence and the proficiency level in the speaking skill. Some of these are:

3.1.1.2.1. Comprehensibility.

In an excellent comprehensible EFL environment, the intentions for communicating a message should be clear in the way that the listener understand the general idea. According to Bin (2011), comprehensibility avoids interruptions during the interaction and prevent interlocutors for formulating requests of clarification. To illustrate, if in a conversation there are two people talking and each of them have different information that want to share, they should be clear enough that the other get the message correctly, avoiding clarification questions and interruptions to take place.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

3.1.1.2.2. Fluency.

Fluency is conceived as the production of the language reserved to the speech, where the person links units of speech quickly, smoothly and without hesitation (Hedge, 1993). In addition, fluency is the ability that influence students to use the language spontaneously and confidently; this skill should be guided by the language teacher, providing spaces and a wide range of expressions in order to allow students to use the language that they are learning (Brown, 2001). Fluency should be given in a natural way, where students can express their knowledge about grammar and vocabulary in a communicative context or just expressing what they want to say. Scrivener (2011) proposes that teachers should reduce their talking time in the classroom to allow students to develop the speaking skill, and so, enhance their fluency. He also argues that teachers must not interrupt students when they are talking because they will lose the flow and they will feel demotivated to continue with their intervention, and the goal of the class, in terms of fluency, will not be achieved.

To continue with the aspects of the speaking, accuracy is another ability that involves the precision in the productive skill as the next lines will present.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

3.1.1.2.3. Accuracy

Accuracy copes with the correctness of the speech, influencing the speaking skill inasmuch as Rahman (2011) states that “speaking means someone can produce correct sentences in pronunciation, grammar and word choice so can be understood” (p.3). In this sense, Gower’s (1995) cited in Bashrin (2013) assures accuracy is the integration of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary in the speech. These aspects will be defined in the following paragraphs:

a) Pronunciation: For many years, pronunciation has been defined as a set of sounds for a specific language, in which aspects, such as stress and intonation take place. Pronunciation can be classified in two aspects as Yates (2002) quoted in Lane (2010) indicates: *segmental aspects* that are shaped by vowels and consonants; these can be produced either by a group of sounds or voice vibrations, which allow words and utterances to be formed, and the *suprasegmental aspects* that are features of speech that go beyond of the individual sounds including stress, tone, duration, rhythm among others that give sense and efficacy at the moment to transmit a message.

Kerr (2010) describes in a document at the ELICOS (English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students) conference, in Melbourne, Australia: how she was able to help a Cantonese speaker of English achieve considerably greater intelligibility by working on his point of articulation (changing his focus of resonance). She also states that almost all English language teachers get students to study grammar and vocabulary when they take part in productive skill activities, but unfortunately some of these teachers make little

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

attempt to teach pronunciation, and its settings, such as particular sounds, stress, intonation, spelling, connected speech, and fluency. In other words, pronunciation does not only make students aware of different sounds and sound features, but it can also improve their speaking. This knowledge can give students extra information about spoken English and help them to improve comprehension and intelligibility. Even though pronunciation is an important part to determine whether our speech is accurate or not, a fundamental aspect in the construction of our oral message is the grammar use.

b) Grammar: The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, 2011) defines the grammatical competence as “the ability to understand and express meaning by producing and recognizing well-formed phrases and sentences.” (p. 113). In other words, grammar deals with the correct structure of sentences and expressions of the language. Although there are few recognized authors that provide a concrete definition of grammar, many authors discuss the importance of grammar in teaching a foreign language; some show to be in favor of rehearsing and strengthening grammar in EFL classroom while others prove to be against its explicit instruction.

Neupane (2009) and Thornbury (1999) highlight in their studies the relevance of grammar instruction in ESL classes, arguing that “research suggests that learners who receive no [grammar] instruction are at the risk of fossilizing sooner than those who receive” (Thornbury, 1999: 16). To contrast, Krashen and Terrell (1983) insist that teaching grammar should not be included in ESL classes because it does not allow the learners to acquire the language in a natural form. In spite of the constant debates made for researchers in the area, grammar prove to be a fundamental aspect in second language learning, being

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

this another ability involved in EFL users. The grammatical competence cannot be developed without having a great amount of words to build sentences and expressions. That is why, vocabulary is the base of accuracy.

c) Vocabulary: Vocabulary has been defined by different authors according to their interests or the language area in which they are working on. Antonacci & O`Callaghan (2012) argue that vocabulary is more than a simple dictionary definition, given the fact that it includes a conceptual knowledge of the words which makes a strong relation with student`s comprehension. Supporting this, Johnson (2012) declares that “vocabulary is such a powerful indicator of concept knowledge” (p.29). In other words, vocabulary knowledge is a manifestation of great command in understanding and creating relationships between concepts and the meanings; therefore, vocabulary is a fundamental base to build knowledge.

Considering the contribution of vocabulary knowledge in English language learning, McCarthy & O`Dell (2012) highlight that the best way of introducing vocabulary to the students is to give them language input through listening and speaking to recognize the words in action since whenever teachers ask students to read or listen, they will want them to see how words are used.

To conclude, accuracy involves different areas of attention, such as pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary which should be taken into account in order to measure the degree of correctness in students` speech. These areas should be constantly assessed in order to improve students` language level. In this way, Scrivener (2011) recommends that when

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

evaluating students, teachers should make clear in which of the aforementioned areas accuracy will play the most important role. This advice is primarily provided for enhancing students' accuracy in speaking in second language learning.

3.1.1.3. Speaking in second language learning.

In educational settings, the development of the speaking skill is seen as priority since learners tend to evaluate their progress in their language course according to how much they can speak. Richards (1990) cited in Richards (2008) indicates that the appropriate approach to teach oral skills is a point of discussion in methodological debates since teachers and textbooks use a variety of them. The approaches could be focused on specific features of oral interaction like turn-taking, topic management, and questioning strategies, or they can be focused on creating conditions for oral interaction through group work, task work, and others. He also argues that at the moment of designing speaking activities in the classroom, having a specific purpose to learn the speaking skill and recognizing speaking's functions from real communication are fundamental aspects to increase students' speaking level.

Each of these dimensions should be linked together to ensure that the speakers can be competent in this skill and that the message can be understood in a way in which they want, taking into account that a minimal variation in the form of a word either by intonation or the style of speaking make the difference between the performance done and the stipulate objective.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

3.2. Oral Interaction

Oral interaction is a productive language skill that deals with daily life social interchanges. However, this concept is more complex than the mere aspect of speaking as it is evidenced in the definition given by Brown and Yule (2003) where oral interaction is “an interactive process where you can construct a meaning that you can produce in every situation, at least at the moment, taking into account those aspects which are participants, context, experiences and the purpose of the communication” (p.4). In other words, the act of communication involves a purpose, an interaction among participants, a shared context and some other aspects that characterizes a daily conversation; these will be expanded in the coming paragraphs.

3.2.1. Characteristics of conversation

Oral conversation is considered as the major portion of daily life’s language made by humans around the world; in fact, human beings produce around 7,000 words by hour in a normal fluent conversation, making the aural/ oral channel the fastest and most used mean for communication (Thornbury & Slade, 2007). The oral productive skill joins a set of features that make it different from other types of discourse, such as written language; in this sense, the aforementioned authors established seven elements of oral conversation, such as:

- a. *Being spoken*: The interlocutor can take meaning from prosodic features, such as sentence stress, intonation, tempo and articulation rate, rhythm and voice quality.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

- b. *Happening in real life*: This is evidenced in the disfluency effects that normally occur in a conversation such as hesitations, word repetition, repairs, false starts, among some others.
- c. *Taking place in a shared context*: In a conversation, where the context is shared, speakers can take for granted that listeners will identify deictic forms, ellipsis and pronouns.
- d. *Being interactive*: It is reciprocally constructed and multi-authored, so no one talks more than appropriate.
- e. *Being informal*: conversation is spontaneous and has interpersonal function. Also, it is basically structured in an informal register in which is evidenced the use of slang expressions and colloquial language.
- f. *Expressing identity*: the presence of vernacular language reflects that a conversation is a resource, in which the social characteristics of an individual are demonstrated, such as *social status, profession, or economic stratification*.
- g. *Conversation is interpersonal*: People exchange information, feelings, and meaning through verbal and non-verbal messages given the fact that it is face-to-face communication.

These characteristics take into account the role of setting, personality and time in oral conversations as it is exposed by the author, this type of interaction occurs in an immediate context where the participants share information, and it allows language errors to arise since there is not much time for preparing a discourse; furthermore, the topics of the speakers are not arranged during an informal conversation.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Taking into account the previous statements, conversation is considered the informal counterpart of the oral interaction, involving feelings, personal opinions and identity. These interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects are linked to the differences that exist between the monologue and dialogue, described in the following lines.

3.2.2. Types of oral interaction

As it was seen previously, the oral interaction has certain features that define the quality and the structure of a discourse. In this sense, Nur Fikri (2012) states a distinction between two types of oral discourse: *monologue* and *dialogue*. This author asserts that monologue is “the speech of one person who expresses his thoughts and feelings in a particular situation and shows his definite conclusion. Monologue is generally prepared speech”; and dialogue involves two or more speakers that can be subdivided into interpersonal and transactional dialogue (Nur Fikri, 2012, p. 1). That is to say, in monologues there is not frequent interaction whilst in dialogues the content is co-created reciprocally.

Another subject involved in oral interaction is the issue of *formality* or *informality* of the discourse and the setting; in this sense, Swarthout (nd) mentions the settings where a formal communication occurs (Presentations at business meetings, classroom lectures and commencement speech given at a graduation ceremony), and informal situations happen (Face-to-face conversations, telephone conversations, discussions at business meetings) that take place in daily life oral interchanges.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Oral interaction is also a necessity in foreign language classrooms, in which the main goal is to apply communicatively through social interchanges what was taught during a series of lessons; so this fact makes pertinent have an insight about how pair and group work can enhance the oral interaction in EFL learners.

3.3. Students' Preferences Regarding Pair and Group Work:

Oral interaction is a complex process which involves several factors that can alter students' performance in both educational and daily life context. In fact, Guerrero (2004) assures that, the accuracy and speed of speech, the variety of words and the complexity of foreign language students' utterances are vastly influenced by several factors, such as the anxiety they feel as they speak, the cognitive complexity of a task, and their proficiency level.

However, learners can rise their language proficiency while those negative factors are dissipated when students work together and collaboratively with their partners since according to Richards & Lockhart (2007), is "through interacting with other students in pairs or groups, students can be given the opportunity to draw on their linguistic resources in a nonthreatening situation and use them to complete different kinds of tasks. Indeed, it is through this kind of interaction that researchers believe many aspects of both linguistic and communicative competence are developed" (p. 152).

In other words, grouping students for the accomplishment of specific tasks incorporating cooperative/collaborative learning and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles, promotes oral interaction improving speaking proficiency.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Nevertheless, taking into consideration that every educational action carries both, positive and negative repercussions, the pro's and con's of grouping will be analyzed.

3.3.1. Advantages and disadvantages of group and pair work in oral interaction

Regarding the advantages of the interactional atmosphere that is created at the moment of arranging group and pair oral discussions, Lightbown and Spada (2006) have found when learners take the initiative to express themselves, they are more spontaneous. Also, in asking questions and responding exercises students use more language functions.

Dividing the class into different groups also facilitates several opportunities to practice and to interact in the target language between learners. In fact, Ur (2009) recommends that teachers working with large classes should divide them into five groups which is the most effective organization for practicing speaking as they will have more opportunities to talk than in full- class organization, as well as develop a sense of independence, cooperation and warmth in class.

Talking about disadvantages of working in pairs and groups in oral performance, Haines (1995) explains that being forced to speak a second language with someone who shares your first language is artificial inasmuch as talking in a foreign language in a context where that language is not used, do not reproduce the learner's natural setting. Nonetheless, it can become quite natural when the teacher talks only in the second language, specify certain parameters and make students use the L2 in communicative tasks.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Furthermore, when the learner works in pairs or groups, it is impossible for the teacher assessing and giving feedback when they are talking. However, it can reduce the number of mistakes once students begin to demonstrate the activity for the whole class since they have the opportunity to practice previously (Doff, 1988). That is to say, although pair and group work do not give enough chances to instructors to correct learners' mistakes, if students' products are then exposed to the whole group, the instructors will have sufficient opportunities to correct language errors.

Finally, the most frequent teachers' fear in grouping is uncontrolled classes, where students begin to make a lot of noise, to speak their native language indiscriminately, or making their assigned task wrongly. In this case, Ur (2009) suggests that losing control of classes is normal, but an analysis of how habituated is the class to make group activities is required, as well as, the selection of an engaging, interesting task for the class.

The relevance of the topics mentioned for this project leads with the need to clarify concepts that the researchers will require for knowing what to observe in the classes, and involving different authors' perspectives in theory will allow to arrive to unbiased conclusions. Besides, theory about errors and oral interaction will permit to contrast EFL theory in the Colombian context, allowing the researchers to know whether the theory adopted have similar implications or not. Finally, the analysis of data and results need a theoretical support that can concede the project reliable and verifiable outcomes.

3.4. Inter Language

Throughout the process of learning a second language, some psycholinguistic structures are activated in the brain, allowing language learners to create connections

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

among their first language and the second one. Thus, the learner can create semantic, phonological or grammatical relationships in two languages that usually lead to the improvement of their language competence; according to Weinreich (1953), these cognitive processes are called “interlingual identifications” and despite the controversy caused by this affirmation, some theories highlight and accept the existence of similar cognitive processes occurring in a foreign language learner's brain. To illustrate, Lennenberg (1967) suggests a *latent language structure* subsisting as “an already formulated arrangement in the brain, considered as the biological counterpart to universal grammar, and it is transformed during certain maturational stages” (Lennenberg, 1967, cited in Selinker 1972, p. 33)

These structures created the basis for the formulation of a theory in which a foreign language learner, who is not completely competent in the second language (L2), create a dynamic system where he preserves some items of his first language, overgeneralize target language rules and create new language forms as a part of his experience with L2; this system was called *Inter language* coined by Selinker (1972).

This premise assures a language learner during his process of learning creates a code between the two languages that produce different type of linguistic outcomes in comparison to a native speaker. In other words, it is a transitive status that occurs when a language user is learning a foreign or second language, so this person creates a new language system mixing the first and the target language structures. In fact, this theory was generated in the observation of a given situation where a native speaker and a foreign language learner had to convey the same sort of utterances, having different results.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Besides, the development of an inter language can produce errors in L2 learners' performance, what makes necessary to review the concepts and specificities of language errors.

3.5.Errors and Mistakes: A General Overview

The errors and mistakes treatment has been a topic of concern by many researchers, mainly in second language teaching. In the same way, a variety of theories exist supporting and rejecting who, where and how correction should take place. However, some definitions seem to have a similarity among scholars involved in the topic. Some of these related with the concepts of *mistake* perceived as a deviation in language that occurs when learners fail to perform their competence, and *error* that is described as a deviation in learner language which results from lack of knowledge of the correct rule as it is proposed by Corder (1967). Nevertheless, in errors and mistakes' research, the role of mistakes is not primarily discussed since they are seen as temporary slips that can be auto-corrected by the learner, and in general, they do not interfere with communication.

Taking into consideration the distinction between errors and mistakes, Edge (1997:9) classified mistakes into *slips*, defined as mistakes that can be corrected by the language learner, and *attempts* as mistakes made by the language user since he does not know how to organize the idea they want to produce. However, for effects of clarity, this project will place an emphasis on *errors* and their classification as the following lines will propose.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

3.5.1. Types of errors for lack of knowledge of language rules

Considering the research made about the topic, some errors characteristics have been added in order to identify errors stages and type of errors with the intention of providing an adequate treatment. In this way, Corder (1967) stated that there are three types of errors: *pre-systematic errors*, referring to those which occur when the learner is unaware of the specific norm in the target language; for example, using *I have 30 years* without being aware of the *verb to be* rule.

Systematic errors characterized for the awareness that the learner has about the rules, but still uses the wrong one; in this case, lack of practice can be the main reason why this sort of error usually appears in language learners. To illustrate, although an English language student can be conscious of the conjugation of the third person in singular, he often does not conjugate correctly the form.

Finally, *post-systematic errors*, occur when learners know the target language rules, but they do not use them consistently. For instance, when a language user knows the sociolinguistic difference between the terms *teacher* and *professor* (the first one to address school tutors, and the second one for addressing University instructors), but he randomly uses them for the same individual.

According to this theory, language teachers should deal with these errors in the first two stages (*pre-systematic and systematic stages*) in order to avoid fossilization as it was addressed previously.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Errors should occur in any of the previously mentioned stages affecting or not the comprehension. The next paragraphs will illustrate the classifications and characteristics of those errors which affect and do not affect the overall understanding of a message.

3.5.2. Types of errors for comprehension

One important aspect that leads to research in the area is the overall comprehension of the message. In this sense, Burt (1975; p. 56) indicated two terms in order to emphasize errors and their relation with comprehension; *global errors* are those that “affect overall comprehension”. For instance, the sentence “*It is good to reason around,*” makes impossible to grasp the meaning (or intention) of the speaker whereas *local errors* “affect single elements and not the comprehension” as in “*a newspapers*” (where “*a*” is unnecessary if it is followed by a plural noun), that does not break down communication between speakers.

In this sense, global and local errors can embrace other error classifications which might be reflected in the phonological, syntactic, lexical and propositional structure of the utterance. These categories will be explored in the following paragraphs.

3.5.3. Varieties of linguistic errors

Errors can arise during the oral and written discourse process through non meaningful units of language. That is to say, there are linguistic errors presented in daily communication that focus on single units of language. These classes are clearly stated by Jaeger (2005) as *Phonological, Syntactic, Lexical* and *Propositional*.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Phonological errors refer to phonological and prosodic units that do not carry semantic content; some of these errors are represented in consonants and vowel sounds, but also in utterances stress or rhyme. For instance, in the utterance *this is a developmental process* / ðiz iz ə dɪˌvel·əpmen'·təl proʊ·'ses /, there is an error of stress compared with what *Cambridge Dictionaries Online* suggests / ðiz iz ə dɪˌvel·əp'men·təl 'proʊ·ses /.

Syntactic errors, on the other hand, involve the organization of phrases and sentences, including misplacement of lexical items, such as words and morphemes, and phrase mixtures. For example, in the sentence *I have a car yellow*, there is a displacement of the word *yellow* given the fact that the adjectives should be located before the noun.

Oppositely, lexical errors are substitutions or blends of meaningful lexical items; some categories of lexical errors incorporate functional and content words, as well as affixes. To illustrate, in the expression "*I am stressing*" the affix "ing" needs to be replaced by the "ed" form.

Finally, propositional errors indicate utterances that a language user elaborates with one intention, but it differs from what he intended to say. That is to say, in the sentence *I brought my carpet, sorry my folder*; the person had an intention which was not reflected in the first utterance, so he instantly corrected himself. In this case, the user could confuse the Spanish false cognate *carpet* (*carpeta*) that in English means folder.

This type of misunderstandings usually can take the form of slips since as it is stated by Jaeger (2005), speakers usually correct themselves when they identify the message do

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

not reflect what they wanted to say; thus, they are the less common type of linguistic error due to the uncertainty of the language user intention.

Last but not least, propositional errors can encircle different error categories at the same time. For example, in the sentence *I have one cats, sorry two dogs*, it is evident a propositional error, as well as, a local and a morpho syntactic error, showing the multiple facets that a single sentence can hold. As it is stated in the example, morpho syntactic errors focus on single linguistic units as is going to be explained in the next lines.

3.5.4. Classification of morpho syntactic errors

Multiple language errors can be formed by single elements; one of the most common are the morpho syntactic, consisting on the lack of accuracy in the structure of single linguistic items, as well as, whole sentences, both in aural and written way. Based on this Krashen, Burt & Dulay (1982) listed the most common morpho syntactic errors in language learning which are omission, addition, misformation and misordering.

Omission errors are described as the “absence of an item that must appear in a well formed utterance”; for example, non-pronouncing the particle *-ed* in the verb *started*. In the contrary, addition errors are characterized by “the presence of an item that must not appear in a well formed utterance”. For instance, *they plays the guitar since they were five*. Moreover, misformation errors consist on “the wrong form of the morpheme or structure”; in particular, *the cat eated a fish*. Finally, misordering errors are defined as “the wrong placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in an utterance”. For example, *have ever you seen my car?* (Krashen, Burt & Dulay ,1982, p. 150-163).

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

These varieties of errors can occur in any moment of a learner's performance; however, where these errors come from is another interesting area that the following extract attempt to explain to the reader.

3.5.5. Sources of errors

The origin of language errors has been also an area of inquiry and research. Regarding the topic, Taylor (1997) proposes three sources of error in which learners' lack of knowledge make interactions likely to commit errors: *Psycholinguistic* refers to the difficulties learners have when producing language, *sociolinguistic* indicates learner's disability to adjust their language in a social context, involving aspects like cultural expressions, sayings and behavior's, *discourse*, on the other hand, denotes difficulties in the organization of ideas constituting incoherent productions.

That is to say, *psycholinguistic errors* refer to language cognitive disorders, such as dyslexia or dysgraphia; *sociolinguistic errors* meaning the lack of knowledge of how to use the language according to the context, such as talking in an informal speech to the boss and finally, *discourse or pragmatic errors* in which learners do not provide precise, relevant information to the listener, such as talking about your friends' mates in a job interview.

Other sources of errors have been classified regarding their origin. In this sense, Dulay and Burt (1973) identified four types of error based on L1 interference and their psycholinguistic origins as they are: *Interference-like errors*, mentioning those errors that take place when learners try to reflect their first language structure in the second; *developmental errors*, indicating errors that the learner makes also in their native language; Besides, *ambiguous errors*, suggesting errors that cannot be categorized as either

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

interference-like or developmental; and *unique errors*, those that are neither developmental nor interference, in other words, personal errors (e.g. saying *upon* instead of saying *weapon*).

Regarding this topic, Harmer (2007) defines *L1 interference* as a phenomenon that occurs when the native language comes into contact with the target language, and this aspect elicits confusion in the second or foreign language learner's use. This can appear as a consequence of a syntactic, phonological or semantic discrepancy between the mother tongue and the target languages. In particular, a Spanish learner who is learning English as foreign language could confuse the meaning of a false cognate word, such as *embarrassed* since it is quite similar in its writing, tense and part of speech with the word *embarazada* that means pregnant.

Furthermore, the author supported that *developmental errors* are presented as a result of "overgeneralization phenomenon" which is presented when the child begins to over-use a new linguistic pattern that has been unconsciously learnt. To illustrate, a foreign language learner has noticed that adding the particle *-er* to some adjectives may compare two objects, and he starts to apply it in every adjective he knows, such as this example: *Mike is intelligenter than his father*.

To sum up, according to Corder (1967) errors are deviations in learner's language resulting from lack of knowledge of the correct rules. Errors can encircle multiple classifications depending on the aspects that errors rely on. In this sense, global and local errors enclose the overall or partial comprehension of the message; in addition, Phonological, Syntactic, Lexical and Propositional errors deal with linguistic units in both

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

spoken and written language. Sources of errors, on the other hand, refer to where errors come from, and they are classified in: psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic error sources.

The relevance of error's theory can expand the researchers' perspectives of how and why language errors are produced in language users. In addition, the knowledge of this topic will provide support to the collection of data in the project, identifying language learners' errors throughout the observations, giving as a result an easier analysis of students' outcomes in order to compare which corrective feedback methods normally fit with the students' errors. However, not in all cases errors can be easily corrected, given mental and emotional limits that produce mistakes to set in learners' brain. This process is called fossilization.

3.6.Fossilization

Every language learner has dealt with mistakes in their performance that remain almost impossible to correct and assimilate as a part of his L2 learning; in fact, the knowledge of linguistic rules in L1 sometimes obstruct the acquisition of L2 rules when those language codes differ in their production of phonemes, organization of syntactic units, etc. In this way, Selinker coined the term *fossilization* for the process in which linguistic items and rules tend to keep in L2 learners' inter language, no matter the amount of explanation they receive in the target language (1972). In other words, language learners use to fossilize errors in their target language in spite of the amount of correction obtained. For that reason, the correction of errors promptly is a valuable action in foreign language

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

classes. However, according to the aforementioned author, fossilized structures tend to re-emerge even when seemingly eradicated.

Certainly or not, the fossilization of errors is an aspect that can vary among individuals, involving emotions, cognitive abilities and language aptitudes. In this sense, a continuous self-monitoring and provision of feedback can be the solutions to lessen the consequences of fossilizing an error. That is why, the next excerpt will talk deeply about error treatment and feedback.

3.7.Oral Corrective Feedback

3.7.1. What is feedback?

The role of feedback is important during a learning process (Brown, 2007). As a matter of fact, feedback is the tool that can guarantee understanding and generate changes in the way students speak through a process of learning a foreign language. That is to say, feedback is the provision of suggestions, encouraging students to correct errors and mistakes in order to improve their proficiency level. Brookhart (2008) argues that success in learning is based on practice and in the manner teachers provide error correction in the areas in which students have more difficulties, in order to improve the language proficiency and achieve the goal that teachers requires at the end of the lesson.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

3.7.1.1. Principles of good feedback practice

In a synthesis of the self-regulation model and research literature on formative assessment presented by Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006), seven principles of good feedback practice are mentioned:

- a. *Good feedback helps clarify what good performance is:* Students need to know and understand the goals to achieve them, for that reason the role of feedback is to help to clarify what teachers or courses want. The best way to ensure that the goals are clear is to provide a written paper which includes the criteria and the standards with a specific definition of the level of achievement.
- b. *Good feedback facilitates the development of self-assessment (reflection) in learning:* an effective way of encouraging reflection on the process of learning is self-assessment tasks; for this matter, teachers need to facilitate students' opportunities to monitor between them in order to recognize and be aware of their own errors. Peer process help to get the ability to make objective judgment.
- c. *Good feedback delivers high quality information to students about their learning:* the information given by the teacher is a tool that students must use to solve problems in their learning, helping them to visualize in which level they are and in which level they must be.
- d. *Good feedback encourages teacher and peer dialogue around learning:* feedback should not be seen as a transmission of information; it should promote dialogue between teachers and students to ensure that errors were understood by the student and at the same time they know how they can be corrected.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

e. *Good feedback encourages positive motivational beliefs and self-esteem:*

feedback does not mean to talk about failures, it refers to the provision of information about progress and achievement; in that sense, the way in which teachers provide feedback can or cannot affect internal factors that have effect in learning. The students need to know that feedback is an evaluation about a performance instead of the person.

f. *Good feedback provides opportunities to close the gap between current and*

desired performance: Feedback supports the students during the process, guiding the performance to be better in the future since students have the opportunity to see what and how the next step is.

g. *Good feedback provides information to teachers that can be used to help*

shape the teaching: Feedback is also important for the teachers because it helps to know what students need and what their deficiencies are to reflect on and take actions to improve the progress in their students.

These principles show the importance that this item has in education, and how a good managing of them can produce positive effects in students and also in learning, but it is also important to mention that feedback can be provided in written or aural way and can be presented in two different ways.

3.7.2. Types of feedback

There are different situations in which feedback can be placed either *positive* or *negative*. Ellis (2009) points out that feedback shows signals which appreciate or not the

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

students' effort. In other words, feedback is not only used to highlight the aspects that students need to improve, but also to indicate that students are doing something good.

Positive feedback shows that students' job is done in a correct way, for instance, teachers express positive signals that appreciate students' work, some examples of these signals are "good job", "all right" and "excellent". These kinds of signals are supposed to affirm the response of the students in the activity, motivating them to improve their skills. However, in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) it does not receive the same importance because in some cases the expressions of "right" or "yes" gives learners the understanding that everything is correct, and they do not need to change anything in the utterance.

On the contrary, negative feedback emphasizes the mistakes students usually make in the process of learning a foreign language. Negative signals as "that's incorrect", "that does not sound right" and "it does not make sense" have the intention that the learner corrects the mistake in order to improve in the language. Negative feedback involves corrective feedback, which is recognized for giving clues to repair errors.

3.7.3. Corrective feedback

Corrective feedback is focused in the negotiation of meaning, and it develops accuracy in second language since "corrective feedback may help learners to notice linguistic forms that they might otherwise ignore and to identify how their deviant utterances differ from the linguistic norms of the language" (Ellis, 2005:19). In other words, in some cases students are not aware of the mistakes they made, but through

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

corrective feedback provided by the teacher or their peers, they can notice that the utterance or the expression used has something wrong.

The aforementioned author also declares that corrective feedback is the learners' functional provider of guidance in order to help students in their language learning process when they are not aware of their errors, mistakes or lack of certain knowledge. To put it in another way, corrective feedback is the information provided by the teacher or peers to help students to improve their language competence through the use of language analysis and reflection. In order to have good results, it is important for the teacher to inspire credibility on students, so that they will trust in his comments, and they will receive it in a positive way. Within corrective feedback, Ellis (2009) considers five main controversies that have taken place in pedagogy.

3.7.3.1. Controversies Regarding Corrective Feedback

As corrective feedback has their supporters in the educational field, retractors also express their discrepancies and talk about the controversies discussed in the field of second language learning in both oral and written form. "The controversy concerning CF centers in a number of issues: (1) whether CF contributes to Second Language (L2) acquisition, (2) which errors to correct, (3) who should do the correction (the teacher or the learner him/herself), (4) which type of CF is the most effective, and (5) what is the best timing for CF (immediate or delayed)" (Ellis, 2009a:4). In other words, the previous features should be taken into account at the moment of providing feedback, resulting for language teachers

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

complicated to know how to provide effective corrective feedback. In spite of multiple studies made within this area, (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005) (Abukhadrah, 2012), (Kavaliauskienė & Anusienė, 2012) among some others, there is not a conclusive answer for all these previous issues given the fact that they vary among the culture, the specific setting (primary, secondary, university learners, etc.) students' personalities, etc. Nevertheless, knowing the types of corrective feedback existent, teachers can find the most suitable way to correct students according to their personality. In the next session, the different ways to provide corrective feedback will be explained.

3.7.3.2. Types of corrective feedback (CF)

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997) there are six different types of corrective feedback to use in speaking skill in which teachers can be based to correct students' errors according to the need of the situation. They are grouped in a table to facilitate understanding.

Type	Definition	Example
Explicit correction	To provide the correct form of the error.	S: I work in my com.....ter. (phonological error) T: Computer, we say computer.
Recast	Implicit way to provide correction.	S: I have class in Monday T: On Monday?

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

		S: oh yes on Monday, I have class on Monday.
Clarification request	To use phrases to indicate that something is not understandable.	S: I go to the swimming pool last weekend. T: Excuse me? I do not understand.
Metalinguistic clues	To ask question or make comments without providing the correct form.	S: the womans are at the spa T: Do we say womans?
Elicitation	To get the correct form by asking the students to complete the sentence.	S: My father are a mechanic. T: If we are talking about third person, we say My father
Repetition	To repeat the student's errors emphasizing intonation.	S: I have a teeth ache (toothache) T: Teethache?

Table 2: Types of feedback

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

The types of corrective feedback in Table 2 helps the teacher to classify the mistakes and at the same time students can analyze the language and correct the mistakes by themselves, according to Tafani (2009) “Feedback is done to attract the attention of the students for the type of the mistakes and for repeated mistakes.” p. 51.

A further study has added two more types of corrective feedback that are prompt and translation; in which Lyster and Mori (2006) (as cited in Rezaei, Mozaffari & Hatef, 2011) define prompt as a category of feedback that consists in the use of the compilation of four of the different types of prompting moves mentioned below in Table 2, that includes: elicitation, metalinguistic clue, clarification request, and repetition; offering learners the opportunity to correct themselves and thus retain the right form. This type of corrective feedback allows students to be aware of their errors in order to correct them by themselves.

The other type, Translation is seen as a way of showing a well-formed sentence of the learner in another language that is not the target language. At the beginning it was seen as a subcategory of recast but (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) cited in Rezaei, Mozaffari & Hatef (2011) argue that recast is a way of showing an ill-formed sentence of the learner although both recast and translation, have something in common and it indicates that there is an error in the language’s production of the learner. It provides positive evidence to the learner to correct the error making a good comparison with another language. All this types of corrective feedback can ensure the success in second language acquisition of a person.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

3.7.3.3. Strategies of corrective feedback

Over the time, several studies have been conducted on how teachers provide corrective feedback, and the results have shown a list of strategies, but these have led to development strategies` taxonomy in a hierarchical order based on how corrective feedback operates in language acquisition. In terms of oral corrective feedback two main distinctions are made; **implicit** corrective feedback which refers to attract the learner's attention without overtly informing that they made an error or without interrupting the flow of interaction vs **explicit** corrective feedback that overtly draw learner's attention to the errors committed, and **input-providing** in which teacher provides the correct form vs **output-prompting** in which students have the opportunity to self-correction: the distinctions can be combined as Ellis (2009) suggests in the table below:

	Implicit	Explicit
Input-providing	Recast	Explicit correction
Output-prompting	Repetition Clarification request	Metalinguistic correction Elicitation Paralinguistic signal

Table 3. A taxonomy of corrective feedback strategies

As we can compare between table 1 and 2 Ellis (2009) adds one different type of feedback which is Paralinguistic signal, which consists in that the learner knows there is something wrong through the uses of gestures and facial expressions. Example, learner

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

says: Tomorrow I go to dance. Teacher with the fingers shows that the sentence must be in future, leaving one finger quiet and moving the other beyond.

In terms of teaching, the instructor should be aware of the strategy and the specific type of corrective feedback. Ellis argues that most of the teachers believed that Input-providing, specifically recast, is the most effective way to provide feedback because the correction is given to the student; in contrast, the author cites Lyster (1998, 2004) who states that output-prompting is better, because the students can correct themselves and it allows students to control their own linguistic errors.

Brookhart (2008) claims other strategies to take into account at the moment to provide good feedback; they can vary:

- Timing: when and how often to give feedback.
- Amount: what to correct.
- Mode: Oral, written or visual/demonstration.
- Audience: Individual or group class.

To summarize, there are many elements that can help or affect the process of giving feedback; for example, the most important aspect to highlight is that depending on the situation corrections can or cannot be effective.

3.7.3.4. Corrective feedback in speaking

In terms of **oral correction**, Thornbury (2007) agrees with Harmer (2007) that giving speaking feedback is not an easy job for teachers since they must select the aspects they will be focused on. In addition, Thornbury considers that interrupting learners in oral

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

activities might disturb accuracy and fluency and students cannot be autonomous because correction is always given. That is to say, the flow of the interaction is important for the students in order to avoid frustration in the speaking activities; for that reason corrective feedback is recommended to be given at the end of the oral activity.

Besides, Harmer claims that feedback is not only for students but also for teachers, while students can see how easy they find speaking activities and what they need to improve, teachers can see how well their class is doing and what problems students are having. In speaking the teacher interruption is appropriate when students are repeating sentences or trying to get the right pronunciation; nevertheless, teachers must be careful in the way they make recommendations to do not produce negative effects in the student's attitude and motivation towards learning.

To summarize, giving feedback in speaking is an essential aspect in the process of learning a foreign language; the clue is to know how to give it in a correct way, what kind of feedback is more compatible with each kind of error and which of them show better results in students' proficiency level. For the elements that speaking cover, as pronunciation, accuracy, fluency among others, there are some strategies that help teachers to give feedback in a better way.

4. LITERATURE REVIEW

Some studies have stated that there is a discrepancy between students and language professors regarding the preferred ways of providing corrective feedback. In fact, there is also a mismatch among the expected emotional reactions that students can experiment after being corrected from the professors' and students' points of view. In the following lines, the development and conclusions of some case studies regarding preferences and attitudes that language professors and university language learners have towards error correction in the oral interaction will be explained.

Kavaliauskienė and Anusienė (2012) examined two hypotheses in their quantitative case study of university students who were taking a course of English for Specific Purposes. The first hypothesis studied whether criticism has a negative impact on student confidence. The second hypothesis reviewed whether perceptions of feedback depend on professional specialization. Kavaliauskienė and Anusienė (2012) explored both hypotheses by investigating students of specialization in either penitentiary law or psychology that were currently studying English for Specific Purposes at the Faculty of Social Policy, Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius.

In this research, there were 24 students of psychology and 26 students of penitentiary law; they were predominantly females at intermediate English levels. In this case, learners spent 4 hours per week for 2 semesters in the foreign language learning process, which amounts to about 130 hours of English instruction. The authors collected the data by handing in a survey which was made on the basis of the standards for Surveys in

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Social Sciences (Dornyei, 2003). The obtained data was statistically processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

Kavaliauskienė and Anusienė (2012) reported in their results that the majority of participants felt that mistakes in learning are inevitable. In fact, 67% of the psychology students versus 86% of the penitentiary law students accepted that awareness of mistakes leads to language proficiency development. Secondly, 74% of the first group of students supported that they preferred professor's immediate correction of errors, as well as the 48% of the second group. The authors reckoned that this method seems to be evaluative rather than formative, and the false discernment of helpfulness of immediate correction probably shows respondents' experience at school, where some teachers feel it is their duty to make corrections as soon as possible.

Thirdly, the 97% of psychology learners and 91% penitentiary law participants agreed with the idea of effectiveness of correction; this clearly demonstrated learners' positive perception of correction. Fourthly, over half of respondents agreed with the point that it was hard to notice their mistakes (57% versus 55%); based on the authors, these results demonstrated the different natural point of view towards perception.

Fifthly, learners' attitudes to develop writing skills are predominant among other language skills inasmuch as statistics of responses reflected that: 88% of the first group and 94% of the second were aware of writing difficulties and potential pitfalls that they encountered in writing activities, so feedback seemed extremely important. Sixthly, students did not seem to worry about undermining their self-esteem: their responses were

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

39% versus 44%. Therefore, authors believed that it was good news for teachers due to the fact that error correction is not expected to affect the learners' motivation or willingness to improve the language skills.

Seventhly, the vast majority of students (94% against 98%) felt positive about usefulness of individual error correction as it facilitated personal learning. Finally, students did not find peer feedback beneficial—only a minority of students supported this statement.

During the development of the study, the authors determined a set of implications. To illustrate, they considered that there were a limited number of respondents. Thus, it might raise a question about the reliability of the findings, so the researchers recommended to do a further study into this issue. Moreover, they found out that the main implications of classroom management for professors are to monitor each student's performance in class activities closely, to give individual feedback for spoken and written product in order to avoid negative feedback all times.

As conclusion, Kavaliauskienė and Anusienė (2012) stated from their results that students of penitentiary law and psychology believed that in order to improve writing skills, learners should receive corrections of written work both on paper or submitted electronically. Finally, they affirmed that although participants were from different specialization programs, attitudes to feedback did not differ significantly.

Similar results were obtained from another study conducted by Abukhadrah (2012) in which 20 Arab male students were examined; they were over 23 years old, studied in a

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

graduate program and were enrolled in an advanced English class at a Midwestern university; as well as, 10 native English teachers with certifications in TEFL.

For collecting data, he conducted some in-depth interviews to students and teachers, and observations of selected classes from the teachers interviewed throughout the study. The findings suggested students and teachers had a positive attitude about corrective feedback. Also, both students and professors expressed that error correction is important for meaningful communication. However, 60% of the teachers thought corrective feedback raised learner's anxiety, whereas 80% students referred anxiety has no influence.

On the other hand, most of the students preferred grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary errors to be the main focus of correction; different from teachers that reported that semantic, grammatical pronunciation and syntactical errors should receive more attention. As a final point, students chose their favorite types of corrective feedback, being *metalinguistic* the most preferred type of correction (90%), then, *explicit feedback* (80%), next *elicitation* (65%), and lastly, *recast* (60%). In contrast, teachers had a preference for *recasts* (80%), and *elicitation* (70%).

This led the author to the conclusion that Arab male students have good attitudes concerning corrective feedback given the fact that they consider it as part of the process of learning. Furthermore, the study indicates that there is a mismatch between students' expectations and teachers' interpretations on the topic of types of errors that needs to be the center of correction and the most preferred types of corrective feedback. In this sense, the researcher proposes that the main reasons why those discrepancies arise are associated with teachers' beliefs considering the communicative approach as the best technique to develop

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

learners' competencies, and the lack of awareness of students' real needs and objectives for learning the language.

Last but not least, the implications mentioned by the author indicate that more research about different types of population as beginners or intermediate language learners is required to carry out. In the same path, involving students' cross cultural differences, as well as, other characteristics, such as age, gender, level of education and beliefs can smooth the progress in order to achieve a more globalized perspective.

5. METHODOLOGY

The research study was conducted with the purpose of highlighting the perceptions that professors and students of an English Language Teaching program have regarding oral corrective feedback in language classes. In order to carry out the mentioned research, the type of study that was selected, the context and setting where it was done, the participants involved, the methods considered to collect the data, the analysis of the information and the ethical considerations will be explained in the following chapter.

5.1. Type of Study

This research project was elaborated by the frame of a qualitative, descriptive, case study that for effects of clarity and comprehension will be divided into three different classifications that will be explained individually. The concepts will be presented respectively.

5.1.1. Qualitative research study

The present research is a qualitative study, considering that the educational scenario implies an analysis of the population, in matters of actions and perceptions. As proposed by Marguerite et al. (2006), qualitative research is based on the study of social factors where the considerations, beliefs and thoughts of the participants are taken into account (p.697).

Therefore, the data collection included the interpretation of the events happening inside the classroom, taking into consideration that a qualitative research study is based on the

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

meticulous description of situations (Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun 2012). This type of study includes five characteristics that defines its core:

- a. *The natural setting of the study as the main source of data where the researcher is an essential instrument.* In other words, the environment and the context of the study can supply valuable data for the project.
- b. *The use of words instead of numbers in the data collection,* as behaviors, attitudes and actions makes unfeasible the collection of data through quantities, numbers or mathematical processes.
- c. *Involving the researcher in the process and the result.* That is to say, the observer-researchers in this project should be engaged and attentive during the whole procedure since their observations will provide the conditions to get the most relevant findings for the case.
- d. *The data collection examined during the study.* In this case, the information collected should be analyzed throughout the process, not at the end.
- e. *How the researcher reports people's thinking.* This is precisely the main area of concern, which proceeded by its complexity, become a challenge for novice researchers (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, cited by Fraenkel, Wallen & Helen, 2012).

All these aspects were relevant at the moment to conduct this qualitative study given the fact that this project placed an emphasis on the interpretation of perceptions and actions of English language professors and students that belongs to an English Language Teaching Program at Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira, regarding corrective feedback in speaking

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

skill taking into account lexical, phonological, syntax, sociolinguistics and pragmatic errors present in language courses.

Given these five characteristics concerning the use of a natural setting, the employment of words instead of numbers, the role of the researcher as an observer, the analysis of the data during the process, and the researcher's ability of capturing the people's thinking can provide a trace to explain the characteristics of a descriptive study.

5.1.2. Descriptive research study

A descriptive research study was developed from the assumption that it is necessary to observe and describe events in order to collect educational evidences.

According to Best and Kahn (2006), a "research study describes and interprets conditions or relationships that exist, processes that are going on, effects that are evident, or trends that are developing" (p.118). In this sense, a descriptive research study helped to systematize students' reactions and teachers' actions regarding the performance of language errors and the provision of corrective feedback, in order to identify how thick descriptions of events helped researchers to arrive to multiple conclusions.

Describing events enhanced new inquiries and solutions as it is explained by Simon (2012) a great part of educational descriptive studies have a relation cause and effect, in which is necessary to describe phenomena with the purpose to change instructional methods and practices. However, this project could not describe and analyze deeply all the

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

population implied; that is why, a study where a small portion of the students was examined is going to be approached.

5.1.3. Case study

As this qualitative research study involved the analysis of contextual conditions, the research method addressed a case study which according to Lodico et al (2006) “has the intention to understand deeply what happens in one particular situation, group or an individual, looking for the meaning and the process” (p.237). In this sense, a small group of participants was analyzed in detail, including all the specific elements which structure the social individual characteristics that at the end of the process were holistically jointed in this method.

To summarize, this research study integrated different types of studies including the qualitative study which considers that the observation of human actions requires the usage of words instead of numbers in both, collecting and analyzing data; furthermore, a descriptive type was approached in order to provide a detailed description of classroom events; and finally, a case study is contemplated on the grounds that just a small portion of the target population was analyzed throughout the project.

All these types of study were required to develop this research since their implementation supplied a thick perspective in the analysis of students’ errors and English teachers’ provision of corrective feedback. In this sense, a deep understanding of the environment in which the study was carried out, provided the sociocultural factors that

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

encircle the target population and thus new corrective feedback perspectives in a specific domain.

5.2. Context and setting

This study took place inside of the sessions of Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa program (LLI), from Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira in Pereira, Colombia. This program has as central objectives to train EFL teachers- researchers that can be integral in the pedagogical and the research practice, and to enhance professionalism capable to adapt to educational, cultural and social demands proposed by the Ministry of Education and other regional educational entities.

The program involve 10 semesters where the first five semesters are focalized in the improvement of English communicative competence, and the other five semesters are implemented a content based instruction model. In this case, the current research focalized on language subjects from first to fifth semester, enclosing the following subjects: Basic English, Pre-intermediate English, Intermediate English, Pronunciation I and II , Academic Discourse I and Conversation II; departing from the assumption that university students taking these courses are expected to commit errors and mistakes frequently that language teachers are more willing to correct, emphasizing the form and not in the content of the discourse.

Considering the pedagogical tools present in this program, the pedagogical models become from general concern. In this sense, the ELT degree is formed by the humanistic,

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

constructivist, reflective- critical pedagogy model in which students are expected to be integral professionals, willing to apply the knowledge conceived in the program in a Colombian context, to be aware of social problematic and to reflect upon their performance, and their strategies to fit with realistic problems.

Finally, each language course is guided, generally by teachers- authorities in the field and educational directors of different academic areas in the program. However, following institutional policies, sometimes professors should guide new subjects, involving them in constant professional challenges.

5.3.Participants

For this study, three types of participants were involved: professors and students, in order to understand the different perspectives of each population, and the researchers who assumed the role of complete observers as stated in the following paragraphs.

5.3.1. Professors

The participants of this study were seven male and female professors that teach language courses in an English Language Teaching program from a T-state University in Pereira, Colombia. These candidates were professors with ages ranging between 24 and 55 years old; they were selected through nonrandom sample since the selection was determined by the courses instead of the professor as Fraenkel & Wallen (2009) suggested, non-random sample is when in the population not all the participants have the same possibility to be selected.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

The method use in non-random sample is the purposive, in which the authors said that the population is selected by the specific purpose of the research adding a personal judgment. According to this study, the prior knowledge of the subjects to be selected within the English Language Teaching program determined that method.

5.3.2. Students

The current research included a group of undergraduate students from a 10 semesters English Language Teaching program (ELT). The target population was composed by the whole group of each subject, where their interventions were used for collecting the data to fulfill the observation grids. However, 15 students were selected for conducting individual interviews, including men and women, ranging between first and fifth semester, and their ages oscillated among 16 and more than 23 years old.

The participants were chosen through nonrandom sample, also called purposive sampling which consists of selecting the population according to a set of rules or participants' profile rubrics, pursuing the main purpose of the study, so the general population does not have the same possibilities to be selected. In this sense, the factor which provided a precedent to the selection of a specific population was the choice of a group of language courses in the program and not the students' or teachers profiles.

In addition, the current researchers composed by a man and 3 women from the same ELT program offered by a State University were seen also as other type of population,

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

and their function in the project was to adopt the role of researchers- observers as it will be explained further in the next session.

5.3.3. Researchers' role.

The researchers' role refers to the function or responsibility researchers performed during the collection of data; in this study the role assumed was as an observer, in which there is not any opportunity to participate in classroom events, nor suggest activities to be executed during the observations. This role required to implement some aspects mentioned in Merriam (2009), these included: the manner to notice issues going beyond seeing things which were not revealed solely by the interviews, the use of knowledge and experiences to analyze what was observed.

Based on the previous statement, the researcher's role in this study was focused on the direction of patterns of communication used by professors to correct errors in oral interaction. To develop this, the researchers did not do any intervention, remaining the intention of not affecting the situation; for that reason, they were complete observers as Fraenkel and Wallen (2009) declare, the complete observer is the one that does not have many opportunities to affect the process or activities of the observed group.

The researchers in this study were observing and taking notes in detail of what happened in the group or with an individual to collect data. Therefore, the following paragraph will specify the instruments of data collection that were used in the study.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

5.4. Methods of data collection

The methods were instruments used in a research process in order to collect data and information that will be used as evidence for further analysis to arrive to findings. In the current research, the methods assembled included observations, questionnaires, interviews and observation grids. Besides this, observations of classroom events were an important method to collect data due to the fact that this provided evidence about individual and social reactions towards the correction of spoken language mistakes within a class.

5.4.1. Observation.

According to Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012) most qualitative research projects require observing people or objects patterns; for that reason, one of the methods of data collection for this study was the observation. In addition, there are different ways to observe according to the particularity of each situation. These are divided into participant and nonparticipant observation, as well as, naturalistic and simulating observations; in order to carry out this study, nonparticipant and naturalistic observations were developed.

Nonparticipants observation refers to the one in which the observers are not involved in the activities (Fraenkel and Wallen; 2009). In this way, the researchers just observed what happened in the classroom without interventions of any kind, so the role of nonparticipants was focused on the different kinds of errors that were presented in oral activities, and also on the kind of feedback provided for each of them.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Naturalist observations, on the other hand, are the ones where the researcher does not modify the situations in the classroom or the actions of the observed people; thus, the classroom events were observed as they occurred by themselves; it means the classes that were analyzed in this project, were prepared by professors and were carried out without any intervention from the observers.

In this way, seven language courses were observed twice, in which two researchers examined students' interventions and the professor's performance. The observation sessions took from one hour to one hour and a half. These participants were analyzed through an observation grid, looking for the types of errors committed in the foreign language, the students' reactions and the use or overlooking of corrective feedback provided by professors and classmates as it is going to be explained in the next lines.

5.4.2. Observation grid

The observation grid, as it is stated by Burke (1993), is an instrument for examining specific abilities, behaviors or attitudes of particular students or all the learners in a class. This technique is commonly used in language classrooms as a way of testing formative assessment tasks. However, the observation grid was used to gather information during and after the observation of classroom events.

This grid consisted of two charts, one for examining error performance and the other for describing the type of corrective feedback given. The first chart included error codes, which are symbols that express different language mistakes committed by EFL learners, in

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

order to let researchers know which language items students failed to perform, including some error categories, such as: Lexical, Phonological, Syntax, Sociolinguistic and Pragmatic errors; these main divisions involved subcategories suggested by Corder's taxonomy (1973), such as: addition, omission and some others with certain adaptations made through some pilot tests implemented in different language courses.

In addition, the second chart included feedback codes, consisting of symbols that stated the clarification or correction of the errors committed in the oral interaction; they were described in order to determine the most common types of feedback made during oral interaction activities, and explore the different reactions students normally showed when they were corrected. Finally, a third piece was added to this grid, involving guided questions about the physical environment, type of activities made in class, and others that enhanced the researcher to write descriptively; furthermore, there was a space for comments used for special remarks and relevant events, that could become pertinent for the study. Thus, each observer had this tool during each observation. (See appendix 1)

Observations provided to the project a great understanding of feedback practices and students' reactions within a class; however, given the fact that this method might include researchers' inferences that sometimes can lead to partial points of view, other methods that involve researchers - participants direct interaction were implemented with the purpose to gather students' and professor's personal criterion. In this case, interviews and questionnaires were chosen to meet this necessity.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

5.4.3. Interviewing.

Interviewing can be described as “an important way for a researcher to check the accuracy of-, to verify or refute-, the impressions he or she has gained through observation” (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012, p. 450). In this sense, interviews are ways to complement the information collected through observations.

Interviewing is defined as a set of formal questions that are designed to obtain specific responses; so a face to face interview was conducted to 15 students individually during the research process in order to obtain enough information about students’ preferences, and reactions towards error correction (See appendix 2). These interviews were recorded with the purpose to have access to the information in any time of the process, being this method reliable in contrast to taking notes or filling forms. This aspect was notified to participants as it is mentioned in the ethical considerations.

5.4.4. Virtual questionnaire

According to Meho (2006) virtual questionnaire is a type of interview categorized as “interview Online, asynchronous and in- depth interviewing” (p.1284), which is responsible for collecting information that participants voluntarily share and which will not be seen or influenced by other participants. This type of interview was done in order to help people who prefer to be interviewed virtually instead of face-to-face, as well as, people who live in geographically faraway places. For the implementation of this study due to professors’ multiple occupations, and the difficulty to find them in a specific time, virtual questionnaire were used; one virtual questionnaire was sent to each professor’s e-mail to be developed

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

through Google questionnaire platform (7 virtual questionnaires as a total) with the purpose to meet professors' beliefs, perceptions and experiences towards corrective feedback (See appendix 3 & 4).

Taking into account this project is a qualitative research, the methods for collecting data were based on the observation of attitudes and reactions towards feedback, as well as, interviews that permitted a clear approximation of populations' beliefs and feelings from previous English language courses experiences. Nevertheless, the analysis of this information collected was required in order to arrive to findings and conclusions of the study. The following session will discuss the methods for examining the data collected.

5.5. Data analysis.

Once the researchers have collected the data, it was necessary to interpret and analyze it correctly in matters of reliability in the study. Indeed, according to Northern Illinois University (n.d.), data analysis consists on a process where logical and statistical methods are used to interpret and evaluate data. In this scenario, the following techniques were used to reflect upon collected information. In this study, the data analysis was examined through grounded theory.

5.5.1. Grounded theory

The concept of grounded theory has evolved along the years. Strauss and Corbin (1993) conceived it as a way for understanding a specific situation with the purpose to elaborate interpretations that will lead to the analysis of collected behaviors of individuals which will

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

supply the basis for building up a theory ; in other words, this method is executed with the purpose to comprehend a specific issue through the analysis of the population's acts, behaviors and reactions that can be analyzed through what the researcher observes, reads or hears in order to create an hypothesis. In this sense, grounded theory was perceived either as a method for collecting data or as a data analysis instrument.

In contrast, Scott (2009) conceived grounded theory as a data analysis method “that will enable you to develop a theory which offers an explanation about the main concern of the population of your substantive area and how that concern is resolved or processed” (p.1). That is to say, through the grounded theory method the researcher will construct a theory that could provide an explanation to the area of concern.

The grounded theory developed in this project followed the steps suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967) based on their qualitative analysis model called the “Constant Comparative Method” consisting of a combination of constant comparisons where all relevant data is coded to generate “new categories and their properties, hypotheses and interrelated hypotheses” (p. 101- 102). That is, the data collected is divided, joining similar situations and characteristics into patterns, and those patterns are arranged in categories in order to create suitable hypotheses, seeking for describing what happens and explaining the possible reasons to those situations. The next stages were followed during data analysis:

5.5.1.1. Transcriptions

The information collected through observations was first hand written in the observation grid, and then written digitally. In this case, two observers per class wrote their

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

own versions, incorporating individual detailed descriptions of each class event, leaving as a result 28 class' transcriptions (7 classes observed twice, by two observers). The next picture shows how one of the researchers filled out the observation grid after the second observation of the Conversation II class:

Name of the observer:		Fecha:	Hour:	Subject:		
Nathalia María Palacio		September 25th	7:15 - 8:35 am	Conversation II Observation II		
ERROR						
Syntax	A	Addition	Linguistic	Uses a different styles		
	B	Word order	It is a not now being			
	C	Deletion	Difference (s)	That changes (s) also -	sometimes (changes) situation	It introduces styles (Tense)
	D	Concordance	Language is correct	Teacher has to be reflect	The changes are larger than	
	E	Tense	The changes has -	language have...	Changes hasn't be (the)	We don't/didn't
Lexical	F	Vocabulary	Arriba	It used singles	Keep one conservative	
	G	Expressions				

Table 4. Sample data collected from observations (Handwritten in the observation grid).

Transcriptions of questionnaires, on the other hand, consisted of the compilation of the opinions given by professors, in a platform created especially for the questionnaire, in which six transcriptions were the result of the professors' answers. The following table represents how the information gathered through this method looked like:

	F	G	H
1	How long have you been teaching	What type of errors do you correct in class?	Which do you consider more important to correct?
3		Syntactic, Lexical, Sociolinguistic, Pronunciation	I would say it probably depends on the topic at hand
4	10 years	Lexical, Pronunciation	Grammar mistakes and pronunciation
5	3 years	Syntactic, Lexical, Pronunciation	Missing words, collocation errors and pronunciation
6	1 year and two months	Syntactic, Lexical, Pronunciation	Pronunciation because that is the way people can

Table 5 . Sample data collected from questionnaires (Taken from Google Forms)

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Finally, recorded interviews were transcribed digitally, where each question was followed by the answers of each participant as the next sample will show:

2. Which errors do you think teachers should correct?

P1: "It also depends of the semester, but in the first learning stages is important to correct the pronunciation. Other errors are also important, but I think phonological errors should be corrected".

P2: "All of them. Emphasize just in one? Like pronunciation. You can know all the grammar, but if you go into a classroom as a teacher, and you do not know how to pronounce well, I don't matter your studies, you won't get respect from me".

P3: Pues yo creo que todos, pero en si los sintácticos porque los lexicales si ya uno... eso es muy autónomo.

Table 6. Sample data collected from recorded interviews (Transcriptions).

5.5.1.2.. Coding and categorizing:

For this second stage, observations transcripts were read for finding similarities between them; thus, these similarities were highlighted with specific colors and then, categories were created fitting with the multiple variables. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967), the first step to analyze the data is to "compare incidents applicable to each category" where the researcher should begin to code each incident into as many categories as possible, doing it with as much information as it emerges from data (p.105). Therefore, several categories related to the errors' performance, feedback provision and omission, students' and professors' reactions, and some others were created as soon as researchers saw there were similar patterns found in data. The next example taken from the analysis of questionnaires demonstrates the way categories were shaped:

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Corrections at the end of the activity
P3 85: After the activity finishes
P2 97-99: In some activities such as oral presentations or role plays, I consider feedback shouldn't be provided at the moment but rather after the activities have finished since in such activities fluency tends to be favored over accuracy.
P4 105-107: Because it is important and necessary to let students produce speech without any constraint. After speech has been produced, specific errors may be pointed out as they can be contextualized to specific situations that may involve sociolinguistic issues.

Table 7. Coding and categorizing of questionnaires.

In that way, for organizing and facilitating the analysis of the information taken from observations, different codes were created in order to know the evidences' origin. Codes for the triangulation of the observations were built from the initial of the first name of each observer (S= Sandra, D= Diana, etc.), followed by the initials of each course (AD= Advanced Discourse, C2= Conversation II, etc.) and finishing in the number of the observation (O1= Observation I, O2= Observation II); the following is a complete example of the codification from observations' transcriptions:

Example: MBEO1: Miguel Basic English Observation I

The following are all the variables for the codes:

1. (M= Miguel, S= Sandra, D= Diana, N= Nathalia)
2. (BE= Basic English, PE= Pre-intermediate English, IE= Intermediate English, AD= Academic Discourse, P1= Pronunciation I, P2= Pronunciation II, C2= Conversation II)
3. (O1= Observation I, O2= Observation II)

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Questionnaires, on the other hand were grouped into categories where a code was created, which represented the number of the professor, signaling the order in which the professor answered the questionnaire (P1= Professor 1,... until P6= Professor 6), and the page where the answer was found.

Example: P3 189: Participant #3/ page #189

Interviews were also grouped into categories, and a series of codes were created, representing the number of the participant (P1= Participant 1, P4= Participant 4, etc.), followed by the type of question (E= Error, F= Feedback, PC= Personal case), and the number of the question. The following example shows a complete code for an interview:

Example: P7.F4= Participant 7, feedback, question # 4).

5.5.1.3. Grouping and integration of categories

Categories already existent, were joined with other categories that presented similarities; thus, there were less categories with broader content. In this sense, Glaser and Strauss (1967) mention for this stage of analysis, different categories and their properties become integrated through constant comparisons to other categories, emerging a theory.

This analysis reduced the quantity of categories, creating broader titles that encompassed more related information from multiple categories, first for the observation

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

method, and then gathering resemblances among interviews and questionnaires. The next sample shows how grouping was made with interviews:

TITLES	CATEGORIES
Common errors corrected by professors in oral activities	<p>Phonetic errors are one of the most corrected in language classes</p> <p>Lexical errors are one of the most corrected in language classes</p> <p>Syntactic errors are one of the most corrected in language classes</p> <p>Sociolinguistic or pragmatic errors are one of the most corrected in language classes</p>

Table 8. Sample of grouping for interviews

5.5.1.4. Delimiting the theory.

Once a group of defined titles were found, a reduction of terminology lead to an integration of titles and the creation of a broader title that could embrace the aforementioned into a general pattern. Reduction of terminology is explained by Glasser and Strauss (1967) as “the discovery of underlying uniformities in the original set of categories, and can then formulate a theory” (p.108). In other words, a reduction of terminology is made as a result of finding more commonalities between categories, where a theory can arise. In this sense, a theory emerged through the triangulation of information taken from the different methods for collecting data, and the information obtained from the theoretical framework, getting as a result sufficient evidences for defending the theory found by researchers, generating a finding. The next chart shows how the first finding was built from delimiting the theory:

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Students
Students' facing errors in oral activities
students' overlooking of errors in oral activities
Paralinguistic features as means of students' error recognition.
Salient errors evidenced in oral activities

Table 9. Sample how the first finding was built.

5.6. Ethical Considerations

The current research followed and respected the ethical considerations proposed by Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012) for a qualitative study. These are: first, to protect the identity of people involved in the study, ensuring that the information collected was carefully used to avoid shamefulness or prejudice. This purpose could be achieved through the use of pseudonyms or names, such as *participant one*, *participant two*. Besides, participants were notified that if at any time the investigation needed to use their names, they had the right to withdraw the participation in the study whenever the participant considered it prudent.

Secondly, people who participated in the study were treated with respect and had clear their role in the study, as well as, the purposes and interests of the project. In this sense, a previous notification- in this case a consent letter- was handed in during interviews and questionnaires, mentioning the participants' rights, benefits, their tasks, what the project is about, and other aspects that could allow them to have complete knowledge of what they had to do to contribute to the project (See appendix 4); in the same manner, devices for recording voice during interviews, were reported and showed previously to participants, so

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

based on this, they could take the decision to take part or withdraw of the project in the moment they decided it.

Finally, participants were ensured that under no circumstances, they would encounter situations that promote physical or psychological aggression. Thus, participants could freely contribute to the project's development, respecting their rights and their information in order to have a good experience as objects of research.

The development of this project depended on a thorough analysis of the data collected from students and professors' answers, expecting all the aspects taken into consideration in the methodology could solve the inquiries existing in regards to this topic. In this sense, the following section will describe the findings related to the purpose of this study.

6. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION:

In this section, three findings divided into different subcategories are going to be explained. Based on the evidence taken from different methods of data collection, the information will be faced with theory with the purpose to support and answer the research questions for this study.

6.1. Students' most salient errors evidenced in oral activities

This finding refers to the type of linguistic errors committed by students learning English as a foreign language when participating in different types of oral activities. Before starting this finding, we would like to define errors and mistakes in order to provide a clearer understanding of this topic; thus, "error" is conceived as an unconscious deviation in learner's language, resulting from lack of knowledge of the correct rule, coined by Corder (1967) as "pre-systematic error". As in contrast, "mistakes" refer to a deviation in language that occurs when learners fail to perform their competence, having their equivalence with systematic errors named by Corder (1967). However, for effects of clarity, errors and mistakes will be approached in the same way inasmuch as the emphasis of this project relies on the multiple linguistic deviations' that were committed during the observed oral activities that will be explained thoroughly during the following lines.

6.1.1. Main linguistic errors committed by learners in oral activities

Although language deviations can be presented in several classifications, the emphasis of this project will be in the linguistic taxonomy suggested by Corder's in (1973). The

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

general categories are syntax, lexical and phonological errors. The following results will sequentially present the information related to the aforementioned categories according to how the author exposed them in the theory. The following examples will show the first category mentioned in his taxonomy:

During the second observation of AD a student had to describe some car keys, and the following deviation appeared:

***MADO2:** The student said: “it is an tool”. He did not show any verbal or nonverbal reaction, so he continued talking.*

In Conversation II students were sharing answers from a mock test, and a student share his point of view:

***NC201 :** The student: “There is an ungrammatical”,*

The instructor: “uh! there is an ungrammaticality” making a stress in the suffix “ity”

The student reacted by opening a little bit her eyes and stretching her lips.

The data in the first sample shows the student added the phoneme “n” after the preposition “a” that is just used when the word that follows begins with a vowel sound. This is considered to be an error of syntax, this type of error encompasses addition errors, where students add phonemes or words that do not concord with the idea or the expressed

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

message. Even though the learner committed this language deviation, this could be interpreted as this was not an error, but a slip given the fact that the student was supposed to be in a B1 level (CEFR,2001) based on the content subject and the fact that this is considered to be an A1 error. As for the second excerpt, it displays an error of omission referring to the non-inclusion of a linguistic particle, such as phonemes or words. In this particular case, the student omitted the particle /ity/, given the fact that during her performance, she was referring to the noun and not the adjective form. Thus, the deviation of the word *ungrammatical* is presumed to be a misuse of the correct morphological structure taking into consideration that when the professor implicitly corrected her, accentuating the suffix “ity”, the student showed surprise opening her eyes demonstrating as she was not aware of the correct structure.

Two other examples of syntax errors are concordance errors, referring to those in which two words do not go together; an example of this is verb patterns, grammatical categories and the conjugation of verbs. Word order errors, on the other hand, refer to the displacement of words, provoking an inaccurate syntax construction of a sentence. These two following examples were taken from the first observation of AD.

In this example students were practicing how to refuse invitations and two errors appeared:

***MADO1:** During the preparation of the dialogue, most of the learners were using Spanish; consequently, they just used English when they had to perform the*

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

activity. So, at the moment of presenting the dialogue, a learner uttered: “beauty eyes”

His partner answered: “thanks for that words.”

This data suggest that there is a grammatical inconsistency, especially in conjugation of verbs and number relation. To illustrate, (the noun *beauty* should be replaced by the adjective *beautiful*) and the disagreement between a singular and a plural particle (*that* is singular, and it becomes plural in *those*). Supported on the observation, students practiced their dialogues and interacted mainly in Spanish; therefore, the overuse of L1 in class, may have led learners to use language items inappropriately.

This example shows there is a word order error that occurred during an activity where students should describe a mobile phone:

***MADO2:** A student said: “a case blue and black”. The student seemed not be aware of this error since he did not stop his speech for correcting himself, and no particular reaction was observed.*

Considering the previous example, it is worth to mention adjectives go before the noun since they are qualifying the object; thus, the sentence should be *a blue and black case*. In this sense, the data indicates the student had an error of L1 interference as it is exposed by Dulay et al (1982), it deals with the automatic transfer of the first language surface structure to the second language structure. This case resembles Dulay’s theory on the grounds that in the Spanish structure adjectives normally are located after nouns unlike English syntax.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

This may also indicate that the learner is still in a low communicative level due to the fact that according to the author this type of errors stand out when the learner has a basic or elementary level.

Another type of error that was evident throughout the observation was tense errors referring to the inappropriate use of time expressions in sentences; thus, the situation is located in a different time period from what is intended.

The next example shows during a student - teacher interaction, a learner intending to explain the instructor how he had done a previous exercise:

***MADOI:** The student said: "After that, we start", when he pretended to refer to a past action.*

Based on the research data collected the previous sentence reflected a common error that can be made as a result of some variables: Due to lack of awareness of the pronunciation of the particle "ed," or lack of practice and internalization of the past tense in speech.

Other type of errors that are produced by EFL learners refer to lexical errors, specifically, vocabulary errors involving lack of vocabulary in L2, foreignization of some words or the use of synonyms that do not correspond to the context, and errors of expression which represent the use of words or phrases that do not signify what was intended as a result of a L1 interference. They are usually lexical chunks that in the English language have an already fixed structure.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Particularly, a deviation took place in the first observation of Basic English course, in which the professor had already taught and practiced vocabulary for giving e-mail addresses, a student provided her email address:

***MBEO1:** The learner said “point” instead of “dot” when giving her email address in a dialogue. It is noticed this word was used as a communicative strategy to make herself understood.*

In this sense, the use of *point* instead of *dot* is considered a vocabulary error as it is evidenced she used a similar word that in the context of emailing is not the appropriate. As the observation was made to students who has a basic command of the language and e-mailing concepts were explained before, it was noticed she had been exposed to this word in previous classes, but the student forgot the suitable word according to the context, using a communicative strategy called “interlingual transfer” used when a speaker transfers a word from his/her mother tongue to a foreign one when the appropriate word in the target language is forgotten (Faerch & Casper, 1983). In this case, the student approximated it to Spanish, where *point* and *dot* share the same meaning (*punto*).

Besides, a student performed an error when he was in a dialogue in pairs that talked about littering and protection of the environment during the Intermediate English course:

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

NIEO2: The learner expressed: “People doesn’t matter the environment”. The professor explained students the use of “matter”, and its difference with “care about”.

The expression *doesn’t matter* changes the meaning of the whole idea as the intention is not to express people are not annoyed by environment, but to indicate a lack of attention or importance to environment. This error can imply a lack of knowledge of the correct expression in L2, as well as, a confusion regarding the use and context of this language chunk.

The last category proposed by Corder (1973) belongs to pronunciation errors, which deal with stress errors, representing the incorrect accentuation of a spoken word, and mispronunciation errors that encompass phonemes that are not produced accurately.

The first example reflects an activity where students had to describe some elements provided by the professor, and in the second example, students were practicing the consonant sound (th) chorally:

*MADO2: A student had a stress error saying repeatedly: “buttons /bɔ:’təns/”
stress error saying repeatedly: buttons /bɔ:t’əns/ and the teacher said: Carolina is
buttons /’bʌt.əns/, be careful with that!*

In the previous example, the word stress is not pronounced properly. During the first intervention occurring in the AD, the L1 interference aforementioned was evidenced when

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

uttering the word with the Spanish accentuation /bɔ: 'tɔ:nes/ instead of the English stress in the first syllable /'bʌt.ən/.

***NP101:** A student was asked to participate, reading and pronouncing some words written on the board, so she said: “think /ti:ŋk/”. She was not able to articulate this consonant, so her partner corrected her multiple times by showing her the way the sound was produced; she finally pronounced it well, but she seemed nervous. This class was the first one in exposing students to the phoneme θ.*

For the second intervention taken from Pronunciation I, the word *think* was overly practiced as it should be pronounced with the phoneme θ rather than the phoneme *t*. The phoneme θ does not exist in the Spanish of the Americas, and taking into consideration this was the first class in which the student was shown this phoneme, it is presumed this error was committed due to a lack of exposure to the sound and how it is produced, as well as, the difficulty this represents in her vocal tract.

Most of the categories previously mentioned incorporated linguistic errors cited by Corder's taxonomy (1973) and adapted from Jaeger (2005); these deviations were evident during class observations and through a careful analysis, they were classified according to their grammatical category and examined to determine the factors why those mistakes were made. Therefore, the target population played an essential role as it was constituted by students whose native tongue is Spanish; thus, some of the linguistic errors presented before showed a pattern of L1 interference. Dulay and Burt (1973) identified four types of errors according to their origin, being one of them the most recurrent in this study.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Interference-like errors, consist of those which take place when learners replicate their first language in the second one. Indeed the authors' statements agreed with some situations that were repeated during the language classes observed due to the fact that students, who are in the process of foreign language learning relied on their first language grammar rules in order to learn the target language. In this sense, some examples of L1 interference were evidenced in the use of Spanish word stress, word order, pronunciation of some phonemes and foreignization of words.

Another aspect observed from this section is the fact that students committed language errors for the lack of knowledge of linguistic rules. Consequently, Corder (1967) stated three types of errors depending on the language learning stages, such as *pre-systematic errors*, referring to those which occur when the learner is unaware of the specific norm in the target language. Therefore, the data collected showed some deviations which were made as a result of the fact that students did not know the correct rule, so they approximated them to their mother tongue, using word stress, literal translations of expressions and word approximation relying on Spanish. *Systematic errors*, on the other hand, are characterized for the awareness that the learner has about the rules, but still uses the wrong one, being lack of practice the main reason why this sort of error usually appears in language learners. In other words, language learners who perform these types of errors have met the correct rule before, but they have not internalized it yet. This definition is compatible with the data collected where some students used target language just when they were asked to do it, yet they did not use it as a code of interaction among their classmates, and as a consequence, the lack of autonomous practice did not allow the assimilation of some language norms. However, sometimes errors were corrected by the

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

professor or peers to avoid the repetition of these mistakes or even fossilization, but in some other cases, tutors and peers omitted the correction of errors due to different reasons as the next lines will explain.

6.2. Professors' reasons for overlooking errors or delaying feedback in oral activities

This finding deals with the omission or delay of error correction during oral activities. That is to say, when students performed errors in productive activities, feedback was not provided by professor or classmates. For effects of clarity, it is necessary to mention that the overlooking of errors may be intentionally or deliberately; that is to say, the professor noticed the error, but he does not correct because the purpose of the activity is different. This finding will embrace those omissions made deliberately taking into consideration that delay feedback can be in certain cases favored over immediate feedback, that the purpose of the message or the completion of instructions can be more important than focusing on language structures and that in order to avoid frustration and negative reactions in students, error correction during fluency tasks is best to avoid.

6.2.1. Professors' focus on content rather than on language structures

An important aspect found through the analysis of the data collected dealt with the focus the professors gave to the activity being assessed. That is to say, sometimes, professors plan activities where understanding students' message and the content of the class is more significant than accuracy of the language students' use. This seems to be a common issue evident in different classes observed. Particularly, the C2 course in which students had to provide their opinions in regards to a concept given in the class:

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

SC201: A student was giving his opinion, and at a certain point he said: “He starts conversation.” Although the professor was looking at the student carefully to understand message, he did not correct him.

In the same way, a professor shared a similar thought in the questionnaire:

PIQ (...) I consider that there must not be extensive feedback on all aspects of the language, but instead, on some components directly related to the subject which is being taught.

In the first example provided the professor omitted correcting the grammatical error, in which the particle *the* is missing before *conversation*. It is possible the professor noticed the error given the fact that he was staring at the student while he was talking. Nevertheless, he was more interested in the students’ opinion about the issue being discussed, and what he was conveying than in the local error he had committed; thus, he did not find relevant to correct this error. As in the second example, the professor mentioned that not all errors should be pointed out, but just the ones that are related with the topics or content which are being taught within the subject matter. The professor considers the correcting aspects that are not related to the topic may be excessive for him and for the learners.

Another sample was taken from P2, where a student asked a question to the professor in regards to a connected speech element she wrote on the board:

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

SP201: The professor wrote a connected speech signal (a linking signal which means two words together should be pronounced as one) below a word.

- *A student asked: "Why you put it?" pointing at the board. The professor answered his question, but she did not correct the student's mistake nor provided any feedback*

From the previous sample, the evidence showed that despite realizing and pointing out the mistake, the professor did not give much attention to the lack of accurateness in the question, but her focus was on the learners' interest to understand what she was doing. Therefore, she valued what the learner was expressing. In other words, as she understood the message, she gave more relevance in answering the student's doubt than in correcting the mistake.

A professor response during the questionnaire supports the same idea:

P5Q: if a student is presenting an oral task, participating, reading out loud, he/she must not be interrupted since what I care is what he/she pretends to say in other words "the message."

This example reveals that the professor is not only more interested on the content, but also on the participation of the learner. He highlights that he prefers not to interfere in students' participation as long as he is able to understand the message which has more relevance for him rather than in students' language deviations.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

On the same line of ideas, professors usually avoid local error correction whenever they place more relevance to students' ability to perform the instructions given instead of their language accurateness.

Evidence of this was found in IE where students were performing a role play about environmental issues:

NIEO2: *The professor asked students to use words for agreeing, disagreeing and providing reasons through the use of different expressions*

NIEO2: *Two students were in a role play and one of them said: "people don't make nothing." This error was not corrected by the professor as he was paying more attention to the expressions or language chunks students used for giving reasons.*

As the example above shows, the professor was focused on whether the students were capable of following instructions by using the language chunks given for the activity. He was also interested in seeing students' ability to relate it to the topic proposed; consequently, the aim of the activity was in evaluating the usage of these words in context and learners expressing their thoughts about the topic. Hence, he overlooked the learner's error on the grounds that he appreciated the fact that the student was able to follow the instructions without any difficulty.

In the same way, Burns, Roe & Stoodt- Hill (2013) assure that facilitators recurrently revise terms and assess learners to examine their comprehension, memorization

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

and application of the language taught, tending to ignore the language accuracy in the speech. Therefore, local errors should not be always corrected given the fact that they do not affect the general comprehension of the message (Corder, 1967).

These ideas agree with the previous examples, where professors gave the instruction to students use certain vocabulary and expressions in their speech, but deviations out of the expected outcomes appeared, giving them less relevance due the fact that these were not completely linked to the instruction provided. In consequence, professors omitted errors.

This research confirms the idea that correcting errors that are not linked with the purpose of a class is not just time consuming, but unnecessary taking into consideration that learners can commit a great variety of errors along their performance, so providing learners corrective feedback associated with the subject matter will focus them in following instructions accordingly, and gaining more knowledge about the topic, avoiding frustration and overwhelming that could appear as a result of over correction.

6.2.2. Professors' omission of errors in fluency-focused activities

The selection of activities is another aspect that influences professors to make the decision whether or not to correct a student; in fluency focused activities, such as role plays, oral presentations, debates and dialogues, professors prefer to ignore errors as a way to incentivize learners' participation, promote interaction and maintain the flow of the discussions. In other words, in these activities in which the professors' purpose is to encourage the development of learners' fluency rather than their accuracy, they prefer not

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

to interrupt learners inasmuch as they give more relevance in the effort students put in expressing themselves and their ideas, as well as, maintaining a positive atmosphere in the classroom

The next example taken from AD, the following data was taken from an observation in which the students were carrying out a role play:

SADOI: *in a role play, in which a student (Juliet) was rejecting a marriage proposal from her classmate (Romeo), the professor omitted giving feedback: when Juliet uttered: "Thank you for that words." Then she continued with her discourse. The professor did not intervene during the whole role play.*

Oral activities where pupils were asked to talk for long periods of time, such as role plays and oral presentations were not interrupted for providing feedback. As a matter of fact, the previous example showed how an error of concordance in which *that* should be replaced for *those* was not corrected by the professor on the grounds that he prioritized maintaining the flow of students' performance and allowing for fluency to be developed, thus he did not interrupt the play. This idea is explained by other professors which supports this:

P2Q: *In some activities such as oral presentations or role plays, I consider feedback shouldn't be provided at the moment but rather after the activities have finished since in such activities fluency tends to be favored over accuracy.*

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

P1Q: *(I avoid giving error correction) probably to favor some fluency in activities such as oral presentations or role-plays.*

According to these statements, during these specific activities, these professors do not recommend to interrupt learners to provide immediate feedback since the aim of these tasks is to develop speaking fluency over accuracy. In this sense, Hernández, Reyes & Murrieta (2012) believe that the fact of favoring fluency over accuracy in oral activities “can be understood as teachers’ concern with learners’ feelings and emotions and their fear of interrupting and inhibiting participation” (p.71) This means, that professors are not only apprehended for the development of the fluency task, but also they fear the fact that correcting a learners when performing an activity that demands a lot of effort may bring or create a feeling of frustration in the learner.

Another consequence that may occur once students are interrupted during oral tasks, such as oral presentations, discussions, role plays among others deal with students losing the track of what they are saying. In this line, students manifested in the interviews their concern when they are interrupted during the aforementioned activities:

S1F2: *(...) but if it is an oral presentation, I think is better after the presentation finishes because if the professor interrupts during the activity , it will cut what we are saying and do not let us concentrate or continue with what we are saying”.*

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

S11F2: It depends; if we are in an oral presentation, I prefer to receive the correction after the activity finishes. Sometimes when they made the correction at the moment, I would forget something that I was going to say after (...)

According to what the first student argues, interrupting during oral activities may stop the flow of what he is saying and consequently, he could find difficult to concentrate again and resume his speech. Thus, the student proposes a solution which is being corrected after the activity finishes. As for the second sample, the student states that the moment for giving feedback depends on the activity he develops; in that case, he suggests that during oral presentations, correction is better to be once the activity finishes, otherwise, the message he wants to express later can be forgotten.

Taking into consideration these two responses, correcting at the moment of learners' performance can create frustration as a result of the fact that students may forget their aim of the message, preventing students from completing their ideas or expressing themselves freely. As a matter of fact, Méndez (2008) assured that correcting students at the moment they perform an error is negative on the grounds that teachers are interrupting the students' speech, which provokes that students lose the intention of their message and draw the communicative intention away as it makes them concentrate in the language form rather than in the communicative purpose. That is to say, interruption is negative since it allows students to forget what they wanted to say and leads them to believe that accuracy is more important than their contributions. In this case, professors should be aware of the fact that oral activities intend to motivate students to practice their oral skills and express their ideas

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

with any constraint; otherwise, motivation can decrease, as well as, their willingness to participate in next opportunities.

Following the same line of ideas, interruption during fluency-based tasks can make the student to have the false concept that their contributions are not worth. This situation can enhance students to stop participating or even decreasing their motivation or self-confidence. Krashen (1983) suggests in the affective filter hypothesis that one of the aspects that provokes a successful acquisition of a second language is the degree of self-confidence in learners. In other words, if students develop self-confidence during the English classes, they will be more likely to learn the language successfully. In contrast, as interruption is demonstrated to produce anxiety, frustration and decrease self-confidence, this fact could interfere with a complete achievement of students' language competences.

Alike, during observations it was evident that professors gave special relevance to fluency over accuracy in oral activities which led to the omission of errors. This situation could be seen as a positive technique to allow learners speak and transmit their message, avoiding the fear of being interrupted (Hernández, Reyes & Murrieta, 2012).

This idea agrees with the fact that interruption inhibits students willingness to participate, producing negative reactions, such as forgetting the message or committing even more errors (Tomczyk, 2013), leading as a result a low fluent performance inasmuch as professors overuse of monitor makes the learner hesitant and excessively slow in his oral outcomes (Stern, 1992). As a matter of fact, this project highlights the positive effects of omitting error correction during fluency- focused activities taking into consideration that interruption generates stress, insecurity, anxiety among other negative feelings in students

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

that can affect their performance, their willingness to participate in following opportunities, and even their motivation in learning a language.

6.2.3. Professors' preferences for giving delay feedback in oral activities.

As it is well known professors' may give feedback immediately or after the activity is over. His decision to correct learners' errors is based on a large list of reasons such as what to correct, when, and who among these reasons as evident in this finding the purpose of the activity, the type of learner and the time he intends to devote to provide feedback. In fact, delay feedback is a strategy some professors incorporate in their lessons with the purpose of not interrupting learners intervention, nor to lengthen the session. To illustrate, during the first observation of the BE, some students were asked to describe a person in a dialogue and two learners said:

***MBEO1:** There were two learners who during their description said: “nineteen /'nainti:n/” and “guitar /'gita:r/”.*

- *No feedback was given since the professor was interested in the content, and she said she would give personal feedback in the following class, while she took notes of students' performance.*

In this case, the students committed two errors of stress as nineteen has its stress in teen and guitar in tar. The data evidences that the professor clearly and explicitly expressed that mistakes would be considered in the following encounter .In this sense, the professor had established clear objectives for the class and focus of the activity. Thus, her interest

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

was on learners' willingness to participate and reduction of stress, and learners conveying their ideas, in spite of their local mistakes which at the end did not interfere with their thoughts or opinions. This affirmation is aligned with Kavaliauskienė and Anusienė (2012) they argue that immediate feedback cannot be given during oral presentations as "...any intervention may raise stress levels and hinder communication" (p.98). That is, interrupting students' performance to provide feedback produces counterproductive reactions, such as anxiety or nervousness, thus learners may fear to participate. As it is evident in this finding, the professor seems to be aware of the fact that it is not necessary to correct learners' mistakes, every time they are made; however, feedback can be given later when relevant.

Moreover, data suggests, that the professor omitted correcting learners as she would personally talk to students in the next section, so this feedback avoidance was made intentionally to focus on students' production and not on items of the language. In addition, based on the observation the professor was constantly taking notes of the errors committed by students, being this strategy one proposed by Kavaliauskienė & Anusienė, (2012) in which teachers register students' mistakes during oral activities in order to present them the following class or when the activity has finished.

This preference for delay feedback provision is in accordance with the opinions some professors provided in the questionnaires:

P4Q: [I prefer to provide feedback after the activity finishes] Because it is important and necessary to let students produce speech without any constraint. After speech has been produced, specific errors may be pointed out (...)

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Similar ideas were found in students' interviews:

S15.F2: Yo prefiero [la corrección] después de que la actividad termine porque tras que interrumpen, una persona puede perder la fluidez, puede desconcentrarse o incluso hacer que el grupo se divida y no ponga atención a lo que uno está presentando [si ésta se hace al momento].

As the professor states, delay feedback should be provided with the purpose to allow students express themselves without speech limits that could breakdown the communication. In fact, the student complemented this idea when she expressed that immediate feedback provokes fluency loss and concentration decreases in the intention of the message. Following the same line of ideas, the results obtained from a study by Tomczyk (2013) showed that both teachers and students favored delay feedback as it allows the learner to finish his idea, avoiding “to forget their initial aim for speaking” (p.928). Thus as the finding shows the professors from this program understand the significance of deliberately overlooking learners errors' and mistakes as it may harm students' feelings and performance. This study goes beyond into this analysis since as both learners and professors agree, interrupting students' performance does not only provoke losing track of what is being said, but it also creates an emotional barrier that does not allow students to freely express their thoughts. Thus, omitting errors and correcting them after the activity finishes or the class has finished is shown as a positive strategy to enhance students' confidence in oral activities

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

6.3. Students' Perceptions towards Oral Feedback

6.3.1. Students' perceptions towards explicit correction strategies:

According to multiple studies in which researchers have been concerned about teachers' versus students' opinions in regards to the way they prefer to correct and being corrected respectively, they have concluded that students favor explicit correction strategies as they consider them beneficial for increasing their linguistic competence (Lee, 2008) (Abukhadrah, 2012) (Brown, 2009) (Schulz, 2001). In that case, explicit feedback is seen as the most direct and fast manner to make students conscious about their errors and consequently, improve their language proficiency. However, these studies do not take into account how explicit feedback is given, and how it emotionally affects students. Therefore, this finding pretends to highlight the importance of considering students' personalities and some aspects to be taken into account at the moment of providing explicit feedback, such as the avoidance of excessive correction and the degree of tactfulness, which is defined as saying something in such a way the person does not get offended.

During the conduction of questionnaires to professors, they were asked whether they considered students' personalities before providing error correction and all of them accepted they usually do:

***PIQ:** Extroverted and mature students can accept feedback, opposed to the introverted students who are normally too shy or insecure to accept public comments of them.*

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

P2Q: For those who are a little more reluctant to receive corrections, I always address feedback-giving in a more tactful way.

As the data from questionnaires indicated, the professors consider students personalities at the moment of providing correction, especially when explicitly correcting them since this strategy is very direct, and puts the students on the spot. Hence, when the error is directly exposed in the classroom, it can affect students' self-esteem, mainly if they are introverted learners, as the professors express. In this way, the first professor assured that while extroverted students could be more willing to accept correction, shy ones tend to be insecure, so they can be emotionally affected once they are corrected in public. In fact, Sharp (1987) affirms that "the introverted person has his own way, barricading himself against influences from outside; he is easily mistrustful, self-willed and suffer inferiority feelings"(p. 65). Based on the aforementioned characteristics, introverted people has a natural predisposition to refuse or devalue any type of advice due to their distrustfulness and inner fragility. This evidence is reflected on the information provided by the professor in which the professor agrees on the fact that introverted learners fear being corrected in front of their classmates

As for the second sample, the professor believes that it is necessary to be cautious when correcting learners that seem to prefer not to be corrected as this may create a barrier that can avoid learners from acquiring the target language when error correction is not given carefully or tactfully. Indeed, not all language professors are aware of being tactful when providing feedback; consequently, sometimes students feel intimidated with explicit

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

correction, and this can be reflected through their body language, facial expressions, or in even by keeping silence during the rest of the class.

The next excerpt took place in the IE course in which a student was explaining the difference between compound and complex sentences, showing a situation where a student did not want to participate anymore:

DIEO1: - *A student made an intervention and said: “it is because is a legal (...)”, but she pronounced /'le:ga:l/ instead of /'li:gəl/.*

- *The professor unconsciously pointed out the student with his finger while he provided the correction.*
- *However, the intonation of the professor’s voice seemed kind of strong, so the student made a facial expression of fear or shame as she seemed frightened. During the rest of the class, she did not participate any more.*
- *Nevertheless, the professor seemed not to be aware the student’s reaction and continued with his explanation.*

This example shows the way the professor corrects a learner when she unconsciously commits a pronunciation mistake. In this particular case, the professor affected the student's vulnerability inasmuch as this correction was not done appropriately in view of the fact that at first the professor pointed at the student when she made the mistake, making evident the student’s error in front of her classmates and secondly, his tone of voice was harsh and this seemed to scare the student; as a result, the student preferred to keep silence and did not participate in the rest of what was left of the class. It was evident that this type of explicit corrective feedback inhibited the student’s willingness to

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

participate. In accordance to Truscott (1999) he argued that explicit corrective feedback may cause “embarrassment, anger, inhibition, and feelings of inferiority” among learners (p.441). As manifested in this example in which the learner was discouraged and embarrassed to continue participation in the class due to the way in which the professor corrected her; this seem to provoke a set of negative emotions that can impede her interacting.

Nevertheless, tactfulness is not the only factor that can affect motivation or self-efficacy in students; constant interruption during oral activities to correct learners’ mistakes seems to be counterproductive as well. In particular, during the second observation of BE, students were sharing their homework answers, reading from their notebooks, but their professor insisted in correcting students’ pronunciation mistakes:

***MBEO2:** Throughout this activity, we noticed that the professor interrupted students constantly to correct their pronunciation errors when they were reading; in this sense, students began to project insecurity for each word they pronounced since one of them started to read with a lot of pauses or cutting some words; indeed, some of them read in low voice as they were expecting professor’s correction. It was observed that at first some students reformulated and then corrected the mistakes, but after a while they just ignore the corrections and continued reading.*

The following data was taken from students interviews, when asked about when they prefer to be corrected:

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

S3F2: *Pues yo creo que es mejor [que me corrijan] cuando la actividad termine porque es incómodo que lo interrumpen a uno.*

Taking into consideration the first sample, the professor overcorrected students during a reading aloud activity interrupting the fluency of the reading. This led to diverse negative reactions in the learners, initially they started hesitating and decreasing their tone of voice, manifesting insecurity in the task once the professor continuously repeated the same pattern; thus, students were expecting to be corrected all the time. In this sense, Stern (1992) proposed that the overuse of monitoring with language learners makes them hesitant and be excessively slow in his oral production. In other words, overcorrection provokes that the student begin to doubt and take a lot of time thinking about the correctness of their performance. This may explain the reactions produced in the previous example in which the students were reading, and the professor over corrected them multiple times.

In contrast to the event that occurred in the previous observation in which the professor overcorrected the student, the data collected from the learner's interview demonstrates that students believe that correction is better when provided at the end of the task due to the fact that constant interruption throughout an activity or in front of the class creates a level of uncomfortability since this interferes or disrupts the fluency of the activity that is being carried out. That is to say, both professor and students have a different perspective about how and when to correct mistakes.

As a matter to conclude, several research studies have displayed the benefits of using explicit feedback as a way to improve learners' language proficiency. Nevertheless, evidences found from this study suggest that professors need to be aware of students'

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

personalities and emotions, as well as how explicit feedback should be given. Whenever these recommendations are not followed, this type of correction may raise students' affective filter, lower their self-esteem and provoke frustration, especially with timid students. Aligned with this finding, Hernández & Reyes (2011) add that "explicit feedback is an activity with many intricate variables to control and if this is not done tactful, then it may be detrimental of class participation" (p. 8). In other words, when explicit feedback is done, the authors suggest professors should consider students' personality, and being especially tactfully to provide correction; that is, being highly cautious to his tone of voice, his body language, and the words used to provide feedback in order to reduce the possibilities of creating a harmful corrective environment that may decrease students' lack of interest in the class, and worst yet in the target language.

6.3.2. Students' preferences towards implicit correction strategies:

Students have different reactions towards correction, in particular to implicit correction, which according to Ellis (2009) refers to attract the learner's attention without directly informing that they made an error or without interrupting the flow of interaction; thus, sometimes learners ignore or do not notice the feedback during a class due to the fact that they may not understand that they are being corrected, they misunderstand the professor's intention or they lack awareness towards the mistake the professor is highlighting. These three aspects give as a result learners' preference for explicit strategies bearing in mind it is more noticeable and easier to correct. On the contrary, some students prefer implicit strategies inasmuch as they are concerned with the way their feelings and motivation can decrease if they face bad experiences when receiving explicit correction. In

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

conclusion, this finding will show two different perceptions: students dislike implicit correction for its ambiguity, and students like implicit feedback for its tactfulness.

6.3.2.1. Implicit error correction is ambiguous

Implicit feedback is a strategy that some professors use in order to care about students' feelings, as well as to let students reflect about their own errors, developing self-monitoring and awareness in the errors language learners perform. Nevertheless, implicit correction can be overlooked by learners given its tacit nature, which leads learners to get the wrong idea from the professor's intention. To illustrate, during the C2 observation students were sharing answers of an exercise made in class:

SC201: The student said "complex" /kɔ:m'ples/.

-The professor raised his eyebrows and said: that is a /'kɔ:mpleks sentens/ making emphasis in the pronunciation of the word "complex", and repeating the student's idea.

-The student did not verbally or nonverbally react. This got me thinking that the student may not have noticed that the professor was trying to correct his pronunciation.

In this case, the lack of an evident reaction by the student after professor provided feedback is interpreted as a lack of awareness of the correction in view of the fact that the professor used recast as an implicit feedback strategy, in which the intention is to merely emphasize on the mistake by repeating the student's idea. Thus, the learner was not able to

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

perceive what was happening. In a study conducted by Karimi (2014), where his aim was to know which type of feedback (implicit vs explicit) was more effective in low-intermediate EFL learners, he highlighted in his results that “while the metalinguistic (explicit) feedback was inevitably noticeable to learners, in the present study more implicit type of recasts (...) turned to be unnoticeable”(p.232). These results demonstrate that implicit correction tends to be overlooked by learners, leading as a result that students prefer more direct ways to be aware of their mistakes.

As a matter of fact, the following excerpts taken from the interviews display some students expressing to be confused when they try to interpret professor’s feedback:

***S10F1:** Explícitamente es la mejor [manera de ser corregido], porque uno ve el error de una y listo, y no se pone a echar cabeza si lo corrigen a uno o si simplemente le complementaron la respuesta. Usted sabe, que cuando lo corrigen a uno por los laditos o indirectamente, siempre queda uno confundido y sin poder saber si dijo algo malo o al profesor le gustó lo que usted dijo.*

***S1F1:** I prefer (...) explicit because when it is in the other way around, I am not sure of what the professor is correcting. I cannot even notice if the teacher is giving feedback, but explicitly, you know exactly what is your error and how is the correct way.*

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

As it is mentioned in the first excerpt, the student considers that explicit feedback is clearer and more tangible than the implicit counterpart given the fact that implicit correction sometimes does not fulfill with professor's intentions inasmuch as students can misinterpret the professor thinking that he is giving positive feedback or highlighting his ideas. Quite the opposite occurs with explicit feedback which goes straightforward to the error, and it does not allow students to create other interpretations different from the professor's purpose. Likewise, the student in the second example argues that when implicit feedback is given, it is complicated and confusing to understand the particular deviation committed. This is one of the reasons sometimes students omit applying feedback due to its lack of clarity and a direct focus in the correction. In that way, the student suggests that using explicit correction is the best way to let a student notices what errors need to be corrected and which their correct versions are.

In conclusion and as a suggestion in this finding, implicit feedback has been perceived as an unsuccessful strategy to give learners feedback as it does not indicate learners their mistakes directly. Students only expressed that this strategy can lead to misunderstanding, frustration and embarrassment which is not the professor's real intention. Another important issue emerges in that the professors may feel that the students simply ignore or pay little attention to their correction when the reality is that learners may not even detect that they are being corrected at all. In such case, professors are suggested to consider learners' level when using explicit or implicit feedback due to the fact that it was evident that lower level students prefer explicit correction for its direct and tacit way to be informed about their errors.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

6.3.2.2. *Implicit feedback is tactful*

Another important aspect that was found in terms of feedback was the fact that some learners agree that implicit feedback was more beneficial than explicit feedback. Some learners, especially from higher semesters from the program believe that implicit feedback can be more assertive since it may avoid feelings of frustration and anxiety when being corrected in any type of activity. Indeed, during the observations there were some situations in which learners noticed implicit feedback once it was given. Higher semester students seem to detect implicit feedback easier than the ones in lower semesters since they become aware of their mistakes and sometimes this permits them to reformulate their sentences.

In the next example occurring in AD, a student who was sharing his answers in regards to a video performed a lexical error:

SADO2: A student said: condiments

-The professor emphasized: Spices?

-Student answer: oh yes spices.

The data shows that a student who made a lexical error, but even when the professor asked implicitly if he was referring to something else, he noticed it, showing awareness of his deviation what conducted him to self-correct his error. Bearing in mind students enrolled in AD course are from 5th to 6th semester, researchers considered students from higher semesters are more conscious about implicit strategies as they already have a more

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

developed pragmatic competence to understand indirect messages in comparison to language beginners. This analysis is based on the fact that advanced learners have more knowledge of the language and may be able to detect some aspects of the language when being corrected, and that they are more mature and experienced; consequently, they have had the opportunity to develop their pragmatic competence. Following this line of ideas, Véliz (2008) assured in his study that high language level students are “a bit more cognitively advanced – and consequently more capable of sorting out underlying meanings and messages- are able to perceive the correction in the form of recasts as they know more about English” (p. 291). That is to say, advanced language students have more linguistic and pragmatic background knowledge than beginners; therefore, they have the capability of interpreting and inferring indirect messages in the discourse, so they are able to comprehend the implicit correction and reformulate correctly their utterances.

As on the contrary, lower semester students will pay more attention to metalinguistic aspects, such as grammar or spelling than to the implicit message transmitted given the fact that they still lack cognitive and educational maturity, so they may not know how to read between the lines. In fact, in a study conducted by Varnosfadrani and Basturkmen (2008), in which they wanted to know the effectiveness of explicit and implicit correction strategies in early developmental and late developmental features, they concluded early developmental learners learnt better with explicit feedback and late developmental features performed better when implicit correction was given.

In fact, during the collection of data from interviews, researchers had to explain most learners (especially from first to third semester) the difference between explicit and

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

implicit correction. This means that students were not familiarized with the implicit correction and consequently, they were less likely to notice it during their first stages of language learning. This analysis was based on the fact that students required an explanation of what explicit and implicit correction was, recognizing explicit correction as the most frequent in class and signaling that the implicit one was unknown or probably, not perceived by them.

As a matter of fact, the following examples from students of higher semesters demonstrated their awareness and their reasons for preferring implicit feedback:

S7F1: I think implicitly is the best way because it feels more comfortable. (Student from fifth semester)

S11F1: Regarding motivation to students, it's better implicitly because you can frustrate the student through an explicitly way, but it is more appropriate the implicit; it's more polite for the students.

Interviewer: And in your case?

S11F1: In my case it's better implicitly, too (Student from fifth semester)

Regarding students opinions about implicit feedback, they highlighted the importance of considering students' feelings and that implicit correction is directly related to politeness. Particularly, the student from the first example assures that he feels more secure and at ease with the implicit correction; in other words, this type of feedback reduces students' levels of embarrassment and fear. Similarly, the second participant preferred implicit over explicit feedback as it is less rude, and it decreases negative feelings as ones

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

mentioned in the previous participant. Thus, based on his arguments, he considered implicit feedback as the most sensitive to ones' feelings. These responses showed students from higher semesters are aware of the implicit feedback benefits in regards to students emotions, feelings and motivation since these participants gave their reasons why they preferred implicit over explicit correction, demonstrating they distinguish these two types of feedback, and they are aware of the advantages or disadvantages of each sort of correction unlike students from low semesters.

To conclude, students' language level plays an important role as it was demonstrated that students in lower language levels use to learn better through explicit correction in comparison to higher levels which tend to receive implicit feedback more positively (Varnosfadrani and Basturkmen, 2008). That is to say, higher level students favor implicit strategies for their tactfulness and sensitiveness, as well as they may be more experienced to understand what is being said to them indirectly. This idea is totally connected with the results of this study, where students from lower semesters used to prefer explicit techniques especially in view of the fact that they did not even know what implicit feedback consisted of.

All in all, this finding demonstrated that perceptions towards implicit feedback depends on large amount to students' language level, so preferences may vary from the early developmental learning stages to the more advanced developmental ones.

7. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was conducted in an institute of higher education which definitely implies certain situations that could interfere or limit its development. Firstly, this research was made in a T-state University in Pereira, Colombia with a select number of participants, professors and undergraduate students enrolled to a language teaching program. Hence, the findings from the study could not be widely used to other university programs in the area since the findings are specific to this setting.

Taking into account the aforementioned, there were several inconveniences in terms of the availability of time and willingness of participation that appeared at the moment to collect data from students' and professor's responses. To illustrate, taking into account professors' multiple occupations, a virtual questionnaire was sent to their personal email with two weeks in advance; however, researchers had to postpone the transcription of data from the planned time margin due to the delay of some professor's responses. On the other hand, researchers reckoned that students had more availability of time, so they sent formal emails inviting students to be part of face to face interviews. Nevertheless, only 3 out of 20 students replied to the email invitation and just those who were called by phone attended the appointment. This situation reflected that email was not an effective channel of communication.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Secondly, although each instrument was piloted before, some of them presented difficulties, so they had to be modified at the last moment. In particular, the observation grid instrument was complex to fill since the spaces for writing were too narrow to widely describe some details, such as: class activities and student's reactions. Hence, a second chart containing feedback codes and students' reactions cases were added, as well as a third page, involving a space for special remarks and guided questions that enhanced the researcher to write descriptively; In addition, the virtual questionnaire and the face to face interviews had some issues regarding the quality and specificity of participants' responses. In this sense, the questionnaire did not allow professors to provide wide information given the fact that some multiple choice questions were not configured to allow the expansion or explanation of the answers, so these responses were limited to a single word. For interviews, on the other hand, researchers noticed there was some information missing that could be relevant for the triangulation with the observation data, so some extra questions were added to fit this necessity during the process.

Thirdly, some students' misconceptions regarding definitions of items during interviews altered the perceptions of some of the participants. To illustrate, students in lower semesters have unclear or have no depth knowledge in regards to the concepts of sociolinguistics and pragmatics; therefore, only students from fifth semester gave a special value to the role of these concepts at the moment of correcting errors. Moreover, some interviewees perceived the explicit correction as cutting, impolite or rude, so their responses reflected this type of feedback as disrespectful, whilst some of them made the distinction this sort of feedback should be given in a polite form. Thus, the misunderstanding of the explicit or direct correction affected the student's responses.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Finally, although observations attempted to explore communicative language errors, such as linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic errors, there was little evidence in matters of sociolinguistic and pragmatic skill. Thus, the first finding just could focus on the linguistic component.

8. CONCLUSIONS

The current research aimed to explore the different perceptions and beliefs students from ELT programs, as well as university professors have regarding corrective feedback, and which strategies are the most effective in EFL scenarios. As the results of this study showed, three different issues were identified in regards to the type and source of errors performed in the observed classes, the reasons why professors overlooked errors during oral activities and finally, professors and students' perceptions towards explicit and implicit correction. These findings will be thoroughly explained in this section.

Firstly, syntax, lexical and pronunciation errors were the most frequent during the study produced as a result of multiple reasons, such as L1 interference, which consisted of students who are in the process of foreign language learning relied on their first language grammar rules in order to learn the target language; lack of practice given the fact that students used target language just when they were asked to do it, yet they did not used it as a code of interaction among their classmates; and lack of knowledge of the correct rule, so students made attempts of L2 outcomes even if they were not sure about the correct linguistic structure.

The second finding illustrated the reasons why professors deliberately avoided error correction. In this sense, this study recommends to correct learners just when the deviation is completely linked to the topic or the objective of the lesson. Likewise, omitting error correction during fluency-focused activities showed to be a relevant strategy to avoid frustration and unwillingness to participate in students. Finally, giving feedback after the

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

activity finishes demonstrated to be an efficient technique to enhance students' confidence during oral tasks.

The last result demonstrated students and professors' perceptions in regards to explicit and implicit correction. In terms of explicit feedback, professors should consider students' personality and being especially tactful to provide correction in order to reduce the possibilities of creating a harmful corrective environment that may decrease students' lack of interest in the class. Moreover, using explicit feedback to students in lower language levels is recommended given the fact that they can be more aware of the errors that they are committing inasmuch as the correction is more noticeable, so they do not have to infer the purpose of the professor's correction. In the case of implicit correction, professors are suggested to consider learners' level on the grounds that higher level students favor implicit strategies for their tactfulness and sensitiveness; furthermore, they have a more developed ability to interpret indirect messages uttered by the professors in the target language.

9. RESEARCH AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

This chapter will explore the different pedagogical implications that professors and language teachers can take into consideration in their teaching practices. Secondly, the research implications can lead researchers to figure out possible subjects that can be addressed in further research.

9.1. Pedagogical Implications

First of all, EFL professors should avoid correcting all the mistakes students commit due to the fact that overcorrection can provoke negative reactions, such as anxiety, frustration, lack of motivation and unwillingness to participate. In this case, correcting just deviations related to the subject matter can let students to express their message without any constraint, enhance participation and make them focus on the purpose of the task rather than on linguistic forms.

Another feature that is worth to mention is the fact of considering the personality and feelings of students when correcting errors in oral activities. In this sense, professors should be tactful to provide feedback, especially when giving explicit correction given the fact that this kind of feedback is very direct, and once it is given on the spot, students may feel vulnerable and their affective filter can increase. Therefore, analyzing students' personality can lead professors to determine whether to use explicit correction with a specific individual or not.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Another relevant pedagogical implication is that professors can avoid oral feedback provision in determined situations. That is, overlooking errors deliberately specifically when they want students to develop fluency rather than accuracy through oral tasks, when they want to give more relevance to the message or to the following of instructions instead of the language form or when they plan in advance to provide delay feedback in an oral performance task.

9.2. Research Implications

The results of this project suggest that for further research, investigators can inquiry about the consequences of the transference of oral errors by professors or by classmates. In other words, during some classes there were inaccurate corrections provided by the professor as well as by classmates that may lead students to assimilate these errors in the speech as correct. Therefore, investigators could explore the source and the influence of oral error transfer over students in EFL classes.

Future research should also investigate which are the students and professors' perceptions about group and peer correction. For instance, during the observations of classes, there were some activities which included peer and group feedback provision among learners. Thus, researchers could analyze why professors implement this kind of feedback in class, and also they could interpret the students' feelings and thoughts toward feedback provision given by their classmates.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

As a final recommendation, researchers might consider to conduct this study with other target population including undergraduate students from different programs, learners from secondary schools, or students from English language institutes. Particularly, the participants of this research differ from other populations as they are enrolled on a language teaching program where they have been exposed to different pedagogical subjects that have made them aware of their future role as language teachers from the beginning, so their perspective towards error correction can be as a teacher in development rather than a EFL student. Thus, replicating this study involving other type of populations can lead to different results given the fact that their perspectives and reactions may not be the same as the participants of this study.

10. REFERENCES

Abukhadrah, K. (2012). *Arab Male Students' Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback: A Case Study*. Ohio.

Al-Jawi, F. D (2010). Teaching the receptive skills. Listening & Reading skills. Umm Al Qura University. Saudi Arabia.

Alvarado, L. (2013). Identifying factor causing difficulties to productive skills among foreign language learners. *Opening Writing Doors*, 10(2), 55-55. Retrieved February 25, 2015.

Arias, E., Ramos, D., & Cárdenas, C. (2013). Retos y realidades de la enseñanza del inglés en Colombia [Challenges and Realities of Teaching English in Colombia].

Antonacci, P. A., & O`Callaghan. C. (2012). Promoting Literacy Development: 50 Research-base strategies for K-8 learners. USA.

Bashir, M., Azeem M., & Hussain A. (2011) Factor Effecting Students' English Speaking Skills. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*.2 (1) 35-50
Retrieved, May 15, 2015, from:
http://www.bjournal.co.uk/paper/bjass_2_1/bjass_02_01_04.pdf

Bashrin, S. D. (2013) Productive skills: teaching beginners in English medium school. BRAC University, Bangladesh.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Best, J., & Kahn, J. (2006). Descriptive Studies: Assessment, Evaluation, and Research.

In *Research in Education* (3rd ed., Vol. 1, p. 118). Boston, Massachusetts:

Pearson Education.

Bin, Z. Saidna (2011) Teaching Speaking Effectively. *Teaching English As Foreign Language (TEFL)*. State University of Makassar.

Retrieved, May 15, 2015, from:

http://www.academia.edu/8491040/TEACHING_SPEAKING_EFFECTIVELY

Brookhart, S. (2008). Feedback: an overview. How to give effective feedback to your

students (pp 4-7) Retrieved March 7, 2015, from: <http://www.ascd.org/publications/>

[books/108019.aspx](http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/108019.aspx)

Brown, D. (2000). Cross-Linguistic Influence and Learner Language. In *Principles of*

Language Learning and Teaching (4th ed., pp. 216-226). New York: Pearson

Education

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (2003). Linguistic forms and functions. In *Discourse Analysis*

(13th ed., pp. 4-9). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. Douglas (2001) *Teaching by principles : an interactive approach to language*

pedagogy. 2nd ed. White Plains, NY : Longman. Retrieved May 15, 2015, from:

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

<https://pedufopenglish.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/teaching-by-principles-douglas-brown.pdf>

Brown, S. (2007). Feedback & feed-forward. *Bulletin*, 22, Centre for Bioscience.

Retrieved March 7, 2015, from: www.bioscience.heacademy.ac.uk

Burke, K. (1993). What are observation checklists? In *How to Assess Authentic Learning*, (1st ed., p. 106). California: IRI/Skyiight Publishing.

Burt, M. (1975). Error Analysis in the Adult EFL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 56-57.

Council of Europe (2011). *Common European Framework of Reference for: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Council of Europe

Chu, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in oral English accuracy development. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(5), 454-459. Foreign language college of Tianjin polytechnic university, Tianjin, China. Retrieved from <http://www.ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/tpls/article/viewFile/0105454459/3074>

Corder, S. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 167-167.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Corder, S.P. (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics* (PP. 274-277). Harmondsworth:

Penguin

Council of Europe (2001). *The Common European Framework of Reference for*

Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.

Davies, P. & Pearse, E. (2002). *Success in English Teaching*. Shanghai Foreign

Language Education Press.

DeWald, K & DeWald, B. (2011). *Participant Observation; A Guide For Fieldworkers*.

United Kingdom. AltaMira press.

Dinçer, A., Yesilyurt, S., & Göksu, A. (2012). *Promoting Speaking Accuracy and Fluency in Foreign Language Classroom: A Closer Look at English Speaking Classrooms.*

Erzincan University, Turkey.

Dinero, R. (2013, August 21). *La apertura económica*. Retrieved March 17, 2015, from

<http://www.dinero.com/edicion-impresa/caratula/articulo/la-apertura-economica/>

182405

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Doff, A. (1988). Peerwork and group work. In *Teach English Teacher's Workbook* (p. 57). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dulay, H. & M.K. Burt. 1973. "Should We Teach Children Syntax?". *Language Learning* 2312: 245-258.

Dulay, H., M.K. Burt & S. Krashen. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press

Edge, J. (1997). Mistakes of form. In *Mistakes and Corrections* (7th ed., pp. 9-11). New York: Longman pearson.

Ellis, R (2005). Instructed second language acquisition a literature review. *Corrective feedback* (pp. 19-22) Auckland NZ.

Ellis., R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. 2nd ed. Oxford:OUP.

Ellis, R (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 journal*, 1, 3-18. Retrieved May 15, 2015, from:
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3#page-1>

Elvesæter, B. & Vaaler, A. (2010, October 24). *Interpretive Case Studies in IS Research: Nature and Method*. Lecture conducted from, Oslo, Noruega.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. 1983. *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. New York: Longman.

Fernández Planas, A. M. 2005. *Así se habla. Nociones fundamentales de fonética general y española*. Barcelona: Horsori Editorial. (Translation by authors)

Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th ed.)*. San Francisco State University: McGraw-Hill.

Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (8th ed.)*. San Francisco State University: McGraw-Hill. p. 438

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis*. In *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research (pp. 105-111)*. Aldine Transaction.

Guerrero, R. (2004). Introduction. In *Task complexity and L2 narrative oral production (p. 1)*. Barcelona.

Haines, S. (1995). Peer work. In *Modern English teacher (1st ed., Vol. 1, p. 55, 58)*. Cambridge University Press.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Harmer, J (2007). How to teach speaking. How to teach English (pp. 87-94). Cambridge UK: Pearson Logman.

Harmer, J. (2011). Mistakes and feedback. In *The practice of English language teaching* (7th ed., pp. 137-138). Cambridge: Pearson Longman.

Hedge, T. (1993) Key concepts in ELT: Fluency. *ELT Journal* Volume 47(3) (pp.275-277) Oxford University Press

Hernández, E., & Reyes, M. (2012). Teachers' Perceptions About Oral Corrective Feedback and Their Practice in EFL Classrooms. PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 14(2), 8. Retrieved May 03, 2016, from <http://www.revistas.unal.edu.co/index.php/profile/article/view/34053/40664>

Hernández, E., Reyes, M., and Murrieta, G. (2012). Oral corrective feedback by EFL teachers at Universidad de Quintana Roo. *Memorias del VI foro de estudios en lenguas Internacional, 6*, 240-253 Retrieved from:
http://fel.uqroo.mx/adminfile/files/memorias/hernandez_mendez_edith_et_al_2.pdf

Hussein, Ahmed (2010) Learner's error and errors analysis. Taken from
<http://es.slideshare.net/ahmedhussein192/error-analysis-22882508>

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

- Jaeger, J. (2004). Chapter 1.4 Classification of system. In *Kids' slips: What Young Learners Children's Slips of the Tongue Reveal About Language Development* (Vol. 1, pp. 22-25). Psychology Press.
- Jing, W.U. (2006). Integrating skills for teaching EFL—Activity design for the communicative classroom. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 3(12).
- Jonhson, E. R (2012). *Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. RTI strategies for content learning*. Sacramento.
- Karimi, M. (2014). The Impact of Teacher's Implicit versus Explicit Corrective Feedback on Learning L2 grammar by Iranian English learners. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(4), 232. Retrieved April 29, 2016, from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=D6F6D4A931F350150F531B24D2567277?doi=10.1.1.685.2629&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Kavaliauskienė, G., & Anusienė, L. (2012). Case study: learner attitudes towards the correction of mistakes. *social technologies*, 1(2), 88–101-88–101. Retrieved February 17, 2015, from http://www.mruni.eu/en/mokslo_darbai/st/archyvas/dwn.php?id=326546
- Kerr, J (2010). ELICOS conference Melbourne Australia.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Krashen, S., Burt, M., & Dulay, H. (1982). Errors. In *Language Two* (1st ed., pp. 150-163). New York: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practices of second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S.D. (1988) *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall International.

Lane, L (2010). Tips for Teaching Pronunciation. Person education. Methodology in Language Teaching: And Antology or Current Practice. In Richards, J. & Rendya , W (2012) (Eds) *Teaching pronunciation* (pp. 175-188). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lee. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 144-155. Retrieved April 12, 2016, from [http://www.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/~aflwrite/article/Student reactions to teacher feedback.pdf](http://www.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/~aflwrite/article/Student%20reactions%20to%20teacher%20feedback.pdf)

Lei, C. (2012). Relations among Peer Feedback, Writing Performance and Writing Improvement: Evidence from a Writing Class in China. *Reflecting Education*, 28(1), 10. Retrieved April 5, 2016.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.

Lodico, Marguerite G., Spaulding, Dean T. & Voegtle, Katherine H. (2006) *Methods in educational research : from theory to practice* (3rd ed., Vol. 1, p. 237- 697). United states of America: Jossey-Bass.

Madhu N. (2009) Processing Instruction: An Input Based Approach for Teaching Grammar . *Journal of NELTA* 14 (1-2) (pp.111-118)

Maicusi, T., Maicusi, P., &Carrillo, M.J. The error in the Second Language Acquisition. Taken from <http://www.encuentrojournal.org/textos/11.17.pdf>

Martínez, J. (2013). An investigation into how EFL learners emotionally respond to teachers' oral corrective feedback. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 15(2). Retrieved from: http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0123-46412013000200009

McCarthy, M., & O`Dell. (2012). *English Vocabulary in Use Upper-intermediate*. Cambridge University Press.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

- Meho, L. (2006). E-mail interviewing in qualitative research: A methodological discussion. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 1284-1295. doi:doi:10.1002/asi
- Méndez, N. (2008). *Teorías sobre el error en el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras y las actitudes de los estudiantes hacia el tratamiento del error en el aula de español* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universidad de León. Retrieved in May 18, 2016, from: http://www.mecd.gob.es/dctm/redele/Material-RedEle/Biblioteca/2010_BV_11/2010_BV_11_1er_trimestre/2010_BV_11_17Mendez.pdf?documentId=0901e72b80e1951b
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- MinEducación (2014). Programa Nacional de Inglés 2015-2025. Colombia very well. Montgomery Coalition for Adult English Literacy: MCAEL teacher toolkit: Teaching the Four Skills. p. 8. Retrieved, May 15, 2015, from: http://www.mcael.org/uploads/File/instructor_library/tt-ch4-teaching-four-skills.pdf
- Nadhani, S. (2009, September 30). Selecting the Right Chart Type for your Data. Retrieved April 15, 2015, from <http://www.tutorial9.net/tutorials/web-tutorials/selecting-the-right-chart-type- for-your-data/>

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Ochoa, O. C. (2014). *Desarrollo de las habilidades comunicativas en el docente.*

[Development of teacher communicative abilities] (1st ed., p.21). Mexico: Edition

Rodio. (Translation made by authors)

Northern Illinois University. (n.d.). *Data Analysis*. Retrieved April 15, 2015, from

http://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/n_illinois_u/dfront.html

Peterson, E. and S. Irving (2008) *Secondary school students' conceptions of assessment and feedback. Learning and Instruction, 18(3), 238–250.*

Proyecto educativo del programa. *Licenciatura en Lengua Inglesa [Program's educational project. English Language Teaching]*. (2014). Pereira, Risaralda.

Rahman. A (2011.). Improving speaking skill by jigsaw. Retrieved May 15, 2015, from http://www.academia.edu/5611079/Improving_speaking_skill_by_jigsaw

Reyes, T. (2013). *The use of face- to- face and e- letters peer correction techniques to improve informal writing* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universidad de la Sabana.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

- Rezaei, Mozaffari & Hatf (2011) Corrective Feedback in SLA: Classroom Practice and Future Directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics. 1 (1)*, 21-29.
- Richards, J. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press. USA.
- Richards, J., & Lockhart, C. (2007). Interaction in the second language classroom. In *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms* (p. 152). Hong Kong: Cambridge University Press.
- Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning Teaching, The Essential Guide to English Language Teaching*.
- Scott, H. (2009). What is grounded theory. Retrieved April 15, 2015, from <http://www.groundedtheoryonline.com/what-is-grounded-theory>
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics. 10*: 209-231.
- Sergio Arboleda, U. (2009). La apertura económica. Retrieved March 17, 2015, from <http://www.usergioarboleda.edu.co/tlc/tratados-libre-comercio-colombia.htm>

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Sharp, D. (1987). The introverted attitude. In *Personality Types: Jung's Model of Typology* (Vol. 31, p. 65). Inner City Books.

SIL International. (1999). The Four basic language skills. Available from: <http://www-01.sil.org/lingualinks/languagelearning/otherresources/gudlnsfralnggandcltrlrnngprg/rm/FourBasicLanguageSkills.htm>

Simon, Y. (2012, January 1). The Purpose of Descriptive Research. Retrieved April 14, 2015, from <http://openphd.blogspot.com/2012/01/purpose-of-descriptive-research.html>

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (2006). Second language learning in the classroom. In *How languages are learned* (3rd ed., p. 137). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1993). Grounded Theory Methodology: An Overview. In *Strategies of inquiry*.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Swarthout, D. (n.d.). Oral Communication: Definition, Types & Advantages. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from <http://education-portal.com/academy/lesson/oral-communication-definition-types-advantages.html#lesson>

Tafari, V (2009). Correcting or not Errors and Mistakes. *Linguistic and Communicative Performance Journal*. 2.(2), 49-57.

Tomczyk, E. (2013). *Perceptions of Oral Errors and Their Corrective Feedback: Teachers vs. Students*. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5), 928. Retrieved February 24, 2016.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Thornbury, S (2007). Towards Autonomy. *How to teach speaking* (pp. 91-93). Pearson Logman.

Thornbury, S., & Slade, D. (2007). The nature of conversation. In *From Description to Pedagogy* (p. 8). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (2009). Classroom Interaction. In *A Course in Language Teaching* (17th ed., p. 232). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VanPatten, B., 1988, How juries get hung: Problems with the evidence for a focus on form in teaching, *Language Learning*.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Varnosfadrani,& Basturkmen (2008).The effectiveness of implicit and explicit error correction on learners' performance. *Science Direct*, 37, 8M.

Véliz, L. (2008, April). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms. *Scielo*, 19, 291. Retrieved July 7, 2016, from http://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?pid=S0716-58112008000100016&script=sci_arttext

Walsham, G. (2005). Doing interpretative research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15, 320-320. Retrieved April 13, 2015, from <http://www.uio.no/studier/emner/matnat/ifi/INF3290/h12/undervisningsmateriale/artikler/walshamdoing-interpretiveresearchejis2006.pdf>

11. APPENDICES

11.1. Appendix 1: Observation Grid

Name of the observer:	Fecha:	Hour:	Subject:
-----------------------	--------	-------	----------

ERROR						
Syntax	A	Addition				
	B	Word order				
	C	Omission				
	D	Concordance				
	E	Tense				
Lexical	F	Vocabulary				
	G	Expressions				
Sociolinguistic & Pragmatic	H	Meaning				
	I	Register				
Pronunciation	J	Intonation				
	K	Stress				
	L	Mispronunciation				

Type of activity

(1) Participation in class (s – T interaction)	(2) Dialogues (ss interaction)	(3) Oral presentations	(4) Plenaries, debates (ss & T interaction)
(5) Discussion groups	(6) Role plays	(7) Other:	(8) Other:

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Observation Grid filled out

ERROR						
Syntax	A	Addition				
	B	Word order				
	C	Omission		(1) Ungrammatical		
	D	Concordance			(1) keep talk	
	E	Tense				
Lexical	F	Vocabulary	(1) Full start			
	G	Expressions				
Sociolinguistic & Pragmatic	H	Meaning				
	I	Register				
Pronunciation	J	Intonation				
	K	Stress	(1) Bureau U ɔ:			
	L	Mispronunciation	(1) Chi(i:)ldhood	(1) Bo(ɔ:)dy language	(1) U(ʊ)tte rance	
			Type of activities			
			1. Participation in class [s – T interaction]	2. Dialogues (ss interaction)	3. Oral presentations	4. Plenaries, debates (ss & T interaction)
			5. Discussion groups	6. Role plays	7. Other:	8. Other:

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Feedback's code								
EC: Explicit correction	CR: Clarification Request	R: Recast	E: Elicitation	MC: Metalinguistic clue	Rep: Repetition	SC: Self correction	G/ I/ P: Group/ Individual/ Peer	
FEEDBACK								
	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction	Type of feedback	Ss and T reaction
A								
B								
C	EC: Unfinished utterance	No possible to see	R: Yes, ungrammaticality (T wrote on the board)	She opened a little bit her eyes and stretched her lips				
D	R: Yes, we engage	She nodded her head and smile	R: it's like redundant	He ignored it and continued writing	R: Exactly, keep talking	No possible to see		
E								
F	R: A false start is...	He showed attention						
G								
H								
I								
J								
K	EC: yes, b(iŋ) r(p):	She nodded her head						
L	CR: Ch(ai)ldhood?	No possible to see	R: Exactly, b(a:)dy language	No reaction	EC: U(a:)tterance	She struggled to move her head and repeat correctly the word		

11.2. Appendix 2: Interview Format

Students interview (English version)

Good (morning, afternoon, evening), my name is _____

Thank you for accepting this invitation to a small survey about your perception towards error correction. My partners Miguel Antonio Caro, Diana Milena Echeverry, Sandra Lorena Díaz, professor Dolly Ramos Gallego and I are conducting a research project called *Professors and Students' Reactions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in an English Language Teaching Program*. It is needed to clarify that the purpose of this instrument is not evaluate, but to know your insights about error correction. This project is executed as a requisite of graduation for the students previously mentioned. Remember that the information provided in this survey is confidential, just for research purposes. If in any moment of the development of this project you wish to withdraw, you may do so. Finally, this interview will be recorded just to facilitate the analysis of data; it will not be used for other purposes without the previous permission of the participant.

General information

Which semester are you taking?

Errors

1. What kind of errors are more corrected in classes by the teacher?
 - Lexical **Example:** *I am stressing* (the affix “ing” instead of the “ed” form)
 - Phonological **Example:** *Voicing* ("vehetabols" instead of "vedjtabls")
 - Syntactical **Example:** *I have a house red* (Displacement of the word)
 - Sociolinguistic or pragmatic **Example:** *What?* (to ask for repetition)

2. Which errors do you think teachers should correct?
 - Lexical
 - Phonological
 - Syntactical
 - Sociolinguistic or pragmatic

3. Which type of errors do you normally commit in classes?
 - Lexical
 - Phonological
 - Syntactical
 - Sociolinguistic or pragmatic

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Feedback

1. How do you prefer being corrected?
 - Explicitly Example: It is not “carpet”, It is “folder”
 - Implicitly Example: **student:** I not like eat
teacher: You do not like to eat (Doing stress in the highlighted words)

2. When do you prefer being corrected?
 - At the moment
 - After the activity finishes
 - After class

3. Which way do you prefer being corrected?

a. In front of the class	b. Face to face	c. Both
a. Collectively	b. Individually	c. Both
a. By your teacher	b. By your classmates	c. Both

4. a. Have you ever had a bad experience when being corrected? Explain.
 b. Have you ever had a positive experience when being corrected that have encouraged you to study more? Explain

5. a. Does your teacher promote peer correction? Yes__ No__
 b. In which activities are they more evident?
 - Self-recording
 - Debates
 - Oral presentations
 - Role plays
 - Dialogues
 - Participation in class

6. a. Does your teacher implement the direct correction teacher- learner?
 Yes __ No __
 b. In which activities are they more evident?
 - Self-recording
 - Debates
 - Oral presentations
 - Role plays
 - Dialogues
 - Participation in class

7. a. Does your teacher implement group correction? Yes __ No __

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

- b. In which activities are they more evident?
- Self-recording
 - Debates
 - Oral presentations
 - Role plays
 - Dialogues
 - Participation in class
8. Which of these types of feedback are commonly used in class?
- a. Self- correction
 - b. Peer correction
 - c. Student- teacher correction
 - d. Group correction

Personal case

9. What do you usually do when you made a mistake, you are aware of it, but you do not receive correction from your professor or your classmates?
- You correct yourself automatically or say *sorry*...
 - You get stuck or frustrated.
 - You make a gesture/ a facial expression / a particular movement/ a change in your posture, etc.
 - You ignore it, and you continue talking.
 - You take it into account for a next opportunity.
 - Other.
10. What do you normally do when you are corrected?
- You correct yourself automatically or say *sorry/ I mean*.
 - You acknowledge the professor/ classmate for the correction.
 - You get stuck or frustrated.
 - You make a gesture/ a facial expression / a particular movement/ a change in your posture, etc.
 - You ignore it, and you continue talking.
 - You take it into account for a next opportunity.
 - Other.
11. Do you usually correct your classmates when they commit a mistake? Yes__ No__
- b. How do you do correction?
- a. You do it individually
 - b. You do it in front of your classmates

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

- c. In which way do you do correction?
- Implicitly
 - Explicitly
- d. When do you give feedback?
- Immediately
 - After the partner give you the floor
 - At the end of the class

Entrevista a los estudiantes (versión en español)

Buenas (Tardes, días, noches), mi nombre es _____

Gracias por aceptar esta invitación a una pequeña entrevista acerca de sus percepciones sobre la corrección de errores. Mis compañeros Miguel Antonio Caro, Diana Milena Echeverry, Sandra Lorena Díaz, professor Dolly Ramos Gallego y yo estamos orientando un proyecto de investigación llamado *Reacciones de profesores y estudiantes frente a la retroalimentación correctiva oral en un programa de licenciatura en inglés*. Es necesario aclarar que el propósito de este instrumento no es evaluar, sino conocer sus pensamientos con respecto a la corrección de errores. Este proyecto es ejecutado como requisito de graduación para los estudiantes previamente mencionados. Debemos recordar que la información recogida por medio de esta entrevista es totalmente confidencial y solo con propósitos investigativos. Si durante el desarrollo de este proyecto usted desea retirar su información, le será respetada su decisión. Finalmente, esta entrevista será grabada para facilitar el análisis de la información, mas no para otros propósitos sin el permiso previo del participante.

Información general

¿Qué semestre cursa actualmente?

Errores

- ¿Qué tipo de errores son más corregidos en su clase por su profesor?
 - Lexicales **Ejemplo:** *I am stressing* (usar el afijo *ing* en vez de *ed*)
 - Fonéticos **Ejemplo:** *Voicing* (Decir *vejeteibols* en vez de *vedjtbls*)
 - Sintácticos **Ejemplo:** *I have a house red* (Desorden en la oración)
 - Sociolingüísticos o pragmáticos **Ejemplo:** *What?* (cuando se pide repetición)
 -
2. ¿Cuáles errores piensa usted que los profesores deberían corregir o dar más énfasis?

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

- Lexicales
 - Fonéticos
 - Sintácticos
 - Sociolingüísticos o pragmáticos
3. ¿Qué tipo de errores usted normalmente comete en clase?
- Lexicales
 - Fonéticos
 - Sintácticos
 - Sociolingüísticos o pragmáticos

Retroalimentación

1. ¿Cómo prefiere ser corregido?
 - Explícitamente Ejemplo: No es “carpet blue”, es “blue carpet”
 - Implícitamente Ejemplo: Do you have a “blue carpet”?

2. ¿Cuándo prefiere ser corregido?
 - En el momento
 - Luego de que la actividad termina
 - Después de clase

3. ¿De qué manera prefiere ser corregido?
 - a. Al frente de la clase b. Cara a cara c. Por ambos
 - a. Colectivamente b. Individualmente c. Por ambos
 - a. Por tu profesor b. Por tus compañeros c. Por ambos

4. a. ¿Ha llegado a tener alguna mala experiencia al ser corregido? Explique.
 b. ¿Ha llegado a tener alguna experiencia positiva que lo haya inspirado a estudiar más o a mejorar? Explique

5. a. ¿Su profesor incita a la corrección en parejas o grupos? Si ___ No ___
 b. ¿En cuáles actividades es más evidente?
 - Debates
 - Presentaciones orales
 - Diálogos
 - Participación en clase
 - Obras de teatro

6. a. ¿Su profesor implementa la corrección directa profesor- alumno?

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Si ___ No ___

b. ¿En cuáles actividades es más evidente?

- Debates
- Presentaciones orales
- Diálogos
- Participación en clase
- Obras de teatro

7. a. ¿Su profesor implementa la corrección grupal? Si ___ No ___

b. ¿En cuáles actividades es más evidente?

- Debates
- Presentaciones orales
- Diálogos
- Participación en clase
- Obras de teatro

8. ¿Cuáles de estos tipos de retroalimentación es más usada en su clase?

- a. Auto corrección
- b. Corrección en parejas
- c. Corrección profesor- alumno
- d. Corrección grupal

Caso personal

9. ¿Qué hace usted normalmente cuando usted comete un error, es consciente de ello, pero no recibe ningún tipo de retroalimentación?

- Usted se autocorrige o dice *lo siento...*
- Usted se bloquea o se frustra.
- Usted hace un gesto/ una expresión facial/ un movimiento en particular/ un cambio en su postura, etc.
- Usted lo ignora y sigue hablando.
- Usted lo toma en cuenta para una próxima ocasión.
- Otro.

10. ¿Usted qué suele hacer cuando es corregido?

- Usted se autocorrige o dice *lo siento...*
- Usted agradece a su profesor o a su compañero por la corrección.
- Usted se bloquea o se frustra.
- Usted hace un gesto/ una expresión facial/ un movimiento en particular/ un cambio en su postura, etc.
- Usted lo ignora y sigue hablando.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

- Usted lo toma en cuenta para una próxima ocasión.
- Otro.

11. a. ¿Usted corrige usualmente a sus compañeros cuando cometen un error? Sí__
No__
- b. ¿Cómo haces generalmente las correcciones?
- a. Lo hace individualmente con él/ella
 - b. Lo hace en frente de sus compañeros
- c. ¿De qué manera corriges?
- a. Implícitamente
 - b. Explícitamente
- d. ¿Cuándo das retroalimentación?
- a. Inmediatamente
 - b. Después que tu compañero deja de hablar
 - c. Al final de la clase

11.3. Appendix 3: Questionnaire Format



Professors' perception about error correction

Hello, LLI professors!

Thank you for accepting this invitation to a small survey about your perception towards error correction. We are Miguel Antonio Caro, Diana Milena Echeverry, Sandra Lorena Díaz and Nathalia Marín and professor Dolly Ramos Gallego. The aforementioned researchers are conducting a study called Professors and Students' Reactions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in an English Language Teaching Program. It is needed to clarify that the purpose of this instrument is not to evaluate but to know your insights about error correction. This project is executed as a requisite of graduation for the students previously mentioned. Remember that the information provided in this survey is confidential, just for research purposes. If in any moment of the development of this project you wish to withdraw, you may do so.

What is your bachelor degree? If you have a master or PhD, indicate it so.

How long have you been teaching?

Where have you taught?

What language course do you currently teach?

You may tick on one or more answers

- Basic English
- Pre intermediate English
- Intermediate English
- Upper- intermediate English
- Advanced Grammar
- Academic discourse I or II

How long have you been teaching language courses?

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

What type of errors do you correct in class?

This section will examine your perceptions towards errors. For this question, you may tick on one or more answers.

- Syntactic
- Lexical
- Sociolinguistic
- Pronunciation

Which do you consider more important to correct? why?

When do you consider errors need to be corrected?

Select one option

- At the moment
- After the activity finishes
- After the class
- After the student's intervention
- Otro:

Why?

Can you distinguish between the student who knows the rule, but commits a mistake, and the student who does not know the rule?

- Yes
- No

What do you do when you notice it?

What do you do when a learner has fossilized an error?

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

How much corrective feedback do you think you provide in class?

Select one option

- 0% - 25%
- 25% - 50%
- 50% - 75%
- 75% - 100%

Explain

How much importance do you think you give corrective feedback in class?

- 0% - 25%
- 25% - 50%
- 50% - 75%
- 75% - 100%

Explain

How do you think errors should be corrected?

Select one option

Through explicit feedback▼

Through explicit feedback

Through implicit feedback

How do you think students prefer to be corrected?

You may tick on one or more answers and support.

- In front of the class
- Face to face
- Collectively
- Individually
- By your teacher
- By your classmates

Explain

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

What do you think are students' reactions towards error correction?

Do you consider students personality before correct him/her?

Sub-question

Explain

What kind of activites do you use when implementing self, peer and teacher feedback?

- Oral presentations
- Group discussions and dialogues
- Debates
- Role plays
- Otro:

Have you ever avoided correcting your students for any purpose? Why?

Have you seen a student negative reaction towards feedback?

If the answer is positive answer the following questions

▼

Yes
 No

Why did it happen?

Answer the following questions in case you selected "Yes" in the last question.

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

What type of feedback was given?

What did you do?

Envlar

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

11.4. Appendix 4: E-Mail Sent To Professors

Invitation to participate in a research study

↑ ↓ x



Download as zip Save to OneDrive

Good evening, professor ~~Marin~~.

I hope you are well.

In the attached document, I am sending you the consent letter (that you already signed) for the participation to the project *Professors and Students' Reactions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in an English Language Teaching Program* in order to let you have your own copy. The idea is that you will be part of our research with the **Academic Discourse I class**, so our partners looked for the schedule of this course, and we can conduct the observations in the following date:

Monday, september 7th from 10 to 12 .(The observations will take from one hour to one hour and a half)

I hope this date is appropriate for you, so in case of having any problem with the schedule, please contact me.

Thank you in advanced for your participation.

Regards,

Nathalia Marín

11.5. Appendix 5: Consent Letter

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Teachers at the English Language Program at a public university in Pereira

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Professor Dolly Ramos Gallego, Master in English Didactics and four students from English Language Teaching Program Diana Milena Echeverry, Sandra Lorena Diaz, Miguel Antonio Caro and Nathalia Marín. This research study will contribute to the student's' thesis as one of the graduation requirements. For this study, you were identified as a possible candidate as our research concerns undergraduate students and English professors guiding language subjects at the English Language Teaching Program offered by Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:

Identifying the different perceptions, attitudes and beliefs students from ELT programs, as well as university professors have regarding corrective feedback, and which strategies are the common in EFL scenarios. In this sense, this project intends to answer the research question, what can be said about University professors' perceptions and students' attitudes regarding oral corrective feedback in language courses within a language teaching program in Pereira?

PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES

1. The teachers who participate in this research study will be observed to notice what kind of feedback they use; students, on the other hand will be observed in order to recognize the most frequent types of language mistakes they do during oral interaction. The observer will choose a small students' population during the observation.
2. Some observations will be recorded to get complete information that the research study requires.
3. The language classes will be observed just one time.
4. Teachers will receive an online questionnaire after the observations.
5. Three students from the course will be interviewed after the observations.
6. Some of the students' interviews will be recorded just for data collection purposes.
7. There is no payment incentive to participate in this study.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

1. The English Language Teaching Program will be benefited as the results of this study will be shared with the academic community in order to reveal teacher's' preferences towards oral corrective feedback and learners' reactions when they receive it and its impact in the teaching and learning process.
2. Teachers will be familiarized with students' preferences towards oral error correction and thus enhance rapport and learners' participation in the classroom.
3. The students can benefit as it will contribute to their teaching development by becoming aware of the types of feedback they should provide learners.

CONFIDENTIALITY

ERROR CORRECTION IN AN ELT PROGRAM

Any information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.

1. Pseudonyms will be used in all documentation related to this research project. All the data, and information gathered will be used solely for this research project and for no other purpose. The data and information (with pseudonyms) will only be furnished to the Universidad Tecnológica de Pereira as the thesis (research) component required for graduation.
2. If activities are to be recorded, only the research aforementioned will have access to them. the information gathered will only be used or shown to meet the research requirement and for no other purpose. Once, the research is complete, all recordings will be erased.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose to participate in this study you may withdraw at any time without penalty or loss. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCHERS AND REVIEW BOARD

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact: Dolly Ramos Gallego at (c) 321 642 2266, email dollytam@utp.edu.co, Diana Milena Echeverry at (c) 3127067013, email dimiecheverri@utp.edu.co, Sandra Lorena Diaz at (c) 3143952697, email salodiaz@utp.edu.co, Miguel Antonio Caro at (c) 3185269965, email macaro@utp.edu.co or Nathalia Marín at © 3177186574, email namarin@utp.edu.co

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been provided copy of this form.

Name of Participant (please print)

Signature of Participant

Date

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

In my judgment the participant is voluntarily and knowingly providing informed consent and possesses the legal capacity to give informed consent to participate in this research study.

Dolly Ramos Gallego

Signature of Investigator or Designee